DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 451 IR 000 281

TITLE	Regional Hearing of National Commission On Libraries And Information Science. Boston, Massachusetts, Wednesday, October 3, 1973. Volume I.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE	3 Oct 73
NOTE	389p.; See also IR 000 282 and IR 000 283
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$18.60
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Government Role; Information Centers; *Information Networks; Information Services; Information Systems; Information Utilization; Librarians; Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Library Services; Local Issues; *National Programs; Opinions; Program Proposals; Revenue Sharing; State Government; Tax Allocation; Technical Assistance; Technology
IDENTIFIERS	Hearings; *Natl Commission Libraries Information Science

ABSTRACT

This document is a transcript of the regional hearing held on the draft of a national library program presented by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Presiding at the hearing were Frederick H. Burkhardt, Chairman, and 12 members of the Commission. The speakers include those considered professionally and technically competent to react to the proposed program. Testimony centers around seven topics: 1) new federal legislation for libraries; 2) inequities in today's system; 3) reasons compelling the government to consider interconnecting the libraries and information centers of the nation according to a national plan; 4) federal investment policy on libraries; 5) responsibilities of the Federal Government toward the development of a national network; 6) state governments' responsibilities toward a national network; and 7) the motivation of a state to belong to the national network. Responding to inquiries from the presiding members, the speakers amplify their written testimony. (CH)

Volume I
Pages 1-388 + 3-A
Exhibits ---

ED 088451

REGIONAL HEARING

of

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

PRESIDING: Frederick H. Burkhardt, Chairman

Carlos A. Cuadra
Leslie W. Dunlap
Daniel Casey
Catherine D. Scott
John E. Velde, Jr.
Bessie Boehm Moore
Charles H. Stevens
Julia Li Wu
Andrew A. Aines
Louis A. Lerner
John Lorenz
Joseph Becker

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

held at
Room 2003A, JFK Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts
Wednesday, October 3, 1973
8:00 o'clock a.m.

- - - - - - -

IR 000 081

DORIS O. WONG ASSOCIATES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
31 MILK STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109
TELEPHONE: 426-2432

CONTENTS

SPEAKER	PAGE
Mr. Stevens W. Hilyard Librarian, New England College Henniker, New Hampshire	4
Mr. Ronald Miller Director, NELINET Wellesley, Massachusetts	16
Ms. Muriel Tonge, President Maine Library Trustee Association Waterville, Maine	29
Ms. Marylou Blecharczyk Assistant Mayor E. Providence, Rhode Island	37
Mr. Douglas Bryant Director of Libraries Harvard University	49
Mr. Rush Welter Bennington College Bennington, Vermont	62
Mr. Joseph Cronin State Secretary for Education Boston, Massachusetts	74
Mr. Walter Brahm State Librarian Hartford, Connecticut	86
Mr. Arthur J. Kissner Fitchburg Public Library Fitchburg, Massachusettts	97
Mr. Raymond DeBuse Worcester Area Cooperative Libraries Worcester, Massachusetts	110
Mr. Nolan Lushington Director, Greenwich Library Greenwich, Connecticut	122
Ms. Elizabeth Myer, Director Dept. of State Library Services Providence, Rhode Island	135

CONTENTS

SPEAKER	PAGE
Mr. James H. Laubach, Jr. Brattleboro, Vermont	143
Ms. Arlene Hope U. S. Office of Education Boston, Massachusetts	220
Mr. Erwin Canham Christian Science Monitor Boston, Massachusetts	229
Mr. Edward Chenevert Portland Public Libraries Portland, Maine	247
Ms. Lydia Goodhue, Chairman Board of Library Commissioners Boston, Massachusetts	258
Ms. Janice Gallinger, Plymouth State College Plymouth, New Hampshire	265
Mr. Richard Huleatt Stone & Webster Engineering Corp. Boston, Massachusetts	272
Mrs. Eleonora P. Harman, Dept. of Education Montpelier, Vermont	285
Ms. Paula Corman North Shore Community College Beverly, Massachusetts	291
Mr. Alan Ferguson New England Board of Higher Education Wellesley, Massachusetts	305
Mr. David Weisbrod, Yale University Library New Haven, Connecticut	322
Mr. William Locke Mass. Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts	338
Mr. John Laucus, Boston University Boston, Massachusetts	331

CONTENTS

SPEAKER	PAGE
Mr. Wolfgang Freitag Fine Arts Library Cambridge, Massachusetts	358
Mr. Marvin Gechman, President Information General, Incorporated Needham, Massachusetts and Mr. Edward Housman GTE Laboratories, Inc. Waltham, Massachusetts	369

* * * * *

PROCEEDINGS

CHM. BURKHARDT: I would like to welcome you all and say it is very good of you to come out on a dreadful morning like this. Let us have the first witness then, who is Mr. Stevens W. Hilyard, Librarian of New England College, Henniker, New Hampshire.

I should say that we try to keep these hearings as informal as we can. I don't think you need read the testimony that you sent in because the members of the Commission will have read it and they will have their questions, but if you have anything you want to add or expand to what you said, please do that now and then we can ask our questions.

MR. HILYARD: Fine.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I read with great interest the document which came in this Monday, as a matter of fact, a draft of a new national program, and was rather pleased to see that the thoughts in this draft regarding the necessity of systems rather than perhaps materials was in line with some of my thoughts; and it is nice to have one's biases supported.

I have one question regarding the draft. The word "access" is used sometimes as a verb and sometimes as a noun; and when it is used as a verb, does it literally mean to produce at the point for the patron the material that may exist in a distaff location?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, I believe it is used in a technical way and perhaps you can --

MR. STEVENS: It may, yes.

MR. HILYARD: Depending upon the context, Mr. Stevens?

MR. STEVENS: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I have objected to using it both ways, of course, but I don't get any place. I am only the Chairman.

MR. HILYARD: I have nothing else that I think I would like to get into now. I see the sound is coming up.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, now your paper gave a pretty good picture of the state of affairs in New Hampshire and you have various problems for cooperation between different kinds of libraries, but now perhaps some of the members of the Commission have a question.

MR. LERNER: I notice that in one of the paragraphs of your paper, Mr. Hilyard, you mention that only 13 out of 50-odd public libraries in New Hampshire have professional staff.

MR. HILYARD: I believe that is a correct figure, even though I am speaking out of some admitted ignorance, not being on the state library staff or public library staff.

MR. LERNER: But it is approximately true then, I am sure.

Let me ask you this question: Do you think that this Commission should address itself more to the problem of training non-professional staff, and what area do you think that we could fulfill on a training and personnel basis with this kind of problem? You are not going to end up with professional librarians in 250 libraries.

MR. HILYARD: Not at all, not at all, and I don't know that any specific change would be brought about by a federal program. The communities get what they pay for, and they pay for what they are willing to pay for; and the moderate or mediocre or non-existent library services in the community with three or four hours being opened a week and a very pleasant lady who does her very best not to bulge large enough in the public's mind to generate any thrust toward a better service or more money; therefore, there being large pools of unemployed librarians now says nothing to that very real problem for us.

MR. VELDE: Mr. Hilyard --

MR. HILYARD: Yes, sir?

MR. VELDE: I notice that -- would it help at all if the Commission would let a state know what is being done in other states? I know some of your problems and I think they have been experienced by other states that have taken little more definite action to try to correct it as far as just financial support and actual grants from the state on a per capita or on a square mile basis; and quite a few of those plans vary, but I wonder if in any way the Commission could help various successful plans be known.

MR. HILYARD: Yes, I think a broad publicization of successful programs would be helpful, but only to a limited extent, because I would be insulting our group state librarian, Bill Allen, if I said that he did not know what was going on in the nation. He experiences frustration and sorrow that he does not make any greater impact on the state-wide library services than he and his staff do.

New Hampshire is, I hope, not peculiar but certainly has not seen fit to fund the human services level. As you may know, it is the only state in the country without a broad-based tax. Some people think that is a good thing. The borrowers and users do not.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: I have a couple of questions.

I am very sympathetic with your situation because I came from Los Angeles City Schools, which is almost as obsolete as your state concerning the library service. I have a couple of questions.

First of all, as far as what Mr. Lerner just asked, does your state have any stipulation stated in the educational code which has something to do with your library service or library standards?

MR. HILYARD: We do not have a job certification and career ladder. Does that partially answer your question?

MS. WU: That is provided in the state code, the education code, right?

MR. HILYARD: That is absent from the state education code. Therefore, we find school librarians with no libarian training.

MS. WU: That's right.

MR. HILYARD: They are library sitters, obviously. I don't mean to paint the grimmest picture. There is a road show in the state librarian and state commissioner of education and it will be finished at the end of this month, and there are public hearings being held throughout the length of the state, trying to ascertain if there is public support which would exercise itself at the polls and exercise itself in a referendum to raise the money to upgrade the system. But no, we do not have the legislation, even if we had the money.

MS. WU: I see. What about your professional association? Do they have any standards?

MR. HILYARD: The New Hampshire Library Association does not have any standards and they don't have a Committee on Certification and Career Ladder. I am chairman of the New Hampshire Library Council, which is the umbrella organization of eight library organizations in the State of New Hampshire, and we do have a committee, but it does do little more than talk to other members of the committee at this juncture.

MS. WU: I see. One more brief question: How do you classify dissimilar libraries and similar libraries?

MR. HILYARD: I would classify them as cooperation between academic libraries and school libraries and public libraries and special libraries.

MS. WU: Okay, thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I believe you said something about the tax base for the libraries. How are libraries actually financed, by local taxation?

MR. HILYARD: Yes, sir. The major bulk of financing is done on the property tax, on the real estate tax, and that, as you could guess, makes it very difficult at the local level for the school boards and the library board of trustees to produce a warrant for the town meeting. We are at that level still in New Hampshire. That requires an expenditure of more money.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Now, Mr. Aines, you had a question. I saw some other hands also. Mr. Aines first.

MR. AINES: I read your paper with enjoyment and I find some rather interesting comments in there, but more interesting is something I read between the lines or do not read. For example, you talk about the problems of the librarians, the problems of the libraries, you have some suggestions for improvement and you have a statement in here, however, that I think is a key question. It is in your afterthoughts area: The first sentence, where you say, "Other very real problems prevent the people of New Hampshire from receiving library services they deserve."

It is this latter clause that I am concerend with, "the services that they deserve."

Somewhere in here you talk about providing union lists, directories, free telephone calls, mailing services. What I would like to know is: What do the people of New Hampshire need and really want?

ERASABLE

RAG CONTENT

MR. HILYARD: I will have to be speaking in some sort of a knowledge vacuum, if you will excuse that expression, because I am an academic librarian and I therefore have a captive audience. The library services that are deserved by the citizens of the State of New Hampshire are those that are deserved by any people, and that is access to the information and the physical tools in which the information is housed that exists in the state regardless of the political affiliation of the borrower; that is, that a public library patron should be able to have access to the books in a college library, even though he is not a student perhaps, regardless of the political affiliation or the physical location.

The problem in the state is, I think, simply one of there being sufficient informational sources at everything but the upper economic level but no propensity or capability to share those out; and the mere problem of distance or ignorance of the existence of information precludes, I would suspect, a good deal of very real use which would be of inestimable benefit.

MR. AINES: May I pursue one more?

CHM. BURKHARDT: On the same subject?

MR. AINES: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes, but we must go rather briefly.

MR. HILYARD: Did that answer your question or did I talk around it, sir?

MR. AINES: Yes, a little bit around, but --

MR. HILYARD: I am sorry.

MR. AINES: But perhaps you can handle it this way. I am hung up for the words "require, deserve, need and want."

MR. HILYARD: All right. I notice that the draft proposal speaks on the second or third page as if everything that anyone wanted would be forthcoming to him. I am not perhaps as generous as that. The ability to give everybody what they want may just be something we can't pay for. However, we should support legitimate needs, where one draws a line between legitimate needs and frivolous needs or needs generated by curiosity -- they may be the same thing. I am waffling around here and I apologize. I am uncomfortable dealing with these words, too.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: Is there a state aid for public libraries in New Hampshire?

MR. HILYARD: There has been state aid for public libraries coming out of the state library, Mr.

Lorenz. To my knowledge that has been terminated because that was federal money that was being shared out by the state library.

MR. LORENZ: So the state does not raise any tax money for public libraries then as far as you know?

MR. HILYARD: No, it does not, Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: Have there been efforts that have failed?

MR. HILYARD: Would you specify that? What type of fund-raising efforts?

MR. LORENZ: Has there been legislation proposed for state aid that has not been successful in the past?

MR. HILYARD: No, I don't believe so. There have been political campaigns run on the basis of a broad-based tax. Those individuals are not in the Governor's mansion now. Therefore, legislation is at this point a moot question.

MR. LORENZ: Do you have some general information as to what has happened to the revenue-sharing funds that have come?

MR. HILYARD: Yes. I look in the Concord Monitor, Concord being the state capitol, with great interest every time that little photocopied blowup is published and I see that we are buying fire engines and refurbishing community centers and paying off the sewage debt, but we are not supporting libraries; and it is not a valid way of supporting libraries. It is a lottery in which the library does not have the ticket even.

MR. LORENZ: Are the University of New Hampshire and Dartmouth libraries used as resource libraries in the state?

MR. HILYARD: Very helpful, and in the past they have both been paid cash grants by the state library to help defray their being more a lender than a borrower.

MR. LORENZ: Is that continuing?

MR. HILYARD: To my understanding, no, it is not.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Mr. Hilyard, in your paper you indicate that if federal aid were forthcoming, it should be channeled to run to three different organizations in the state. What are the pros and cons of each of those three?

MR. HILYARD: The New Hampshire Library Council is an organization of organizations and perhaps its membership, which is the president and vice-president of all of the constituent organizations, most broadly represents the library community in the state. It consists of friends and trustees as well as practicing librarians in the various areas. The state library obviously has both the manpower and the experience in doing this, and yet they are not as broadly representative as the New Hampshire Library Council.

MR. BECKER: Is the Council a government body?

MR. HILYARD: No. The Council is a self-generative body, Mr. Becker, which has no legal standing, is not incorporated, probably could not receive and disburse monies. That is a mechanical problem only. The third group is --

MR. BECKER: The State Library Commission?

MR. HILYARD: The State Library Commission, which is chartered and charged by legislation to be responsible for the library system in the State of New Hampshire. A parenthesis should be put halfway through that sentence and say "public library." They, however, are the state librarians' bosses and could more generally be seen as having the responsibility.

I was trying to get up the problem that we have felt in New Hampshire and I am sure other states feel it as well for years, and that is,the criteria that come in from Washington are very often irrelevant to us.

Grants from minorities are something we can't touch because the French-Canadian population is not considered an ethnic minority; we don't have Puerto Ricans and we do not have blacks. We do have a very real problem with French-speaking, the French-Canadian population. However, we are, if I may say, a little suspicious of criteria developed and channels developed outside which are so distant from us that they don't understand where the real needs are.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Hilyard.

MR. HILYARD: Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

CHM. BURKHARDT: All right, we must get on.

Our next witness is Mr. Ronald Miller, the Director of NELINET.

Greetings, Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I had thought to divide some preliminary comments into three areas, but I see there is a lush base of questions, so I think I am going to truncate that strategy and merely make a few statements at the beginning and then leave myself open. I must say that we are grateful that you are here for one reason: You are already giving us something, which is to say a forum, through

ERASABLE
RAG CONTENT

which we ourselves can see how we look to others; and we have, therefore, made it a point to have staff here all day to see if we can get a sense of what the regional problems are ourselves.

I reviewed the reports which described your hearings in Chicago and San Francisco and a rubricated statement of Mr. Citizen being absent at some of those hearings, I hope, has fixed this today. I am not sure whether you are going to have lay people here in response to your public hearings in the middle of the day.

One or two comments about my written testimony, and then I would like to make an observation concerning your draft of the new national program on Libraries and Information Science, and then I will be open for questions.

The two assumptions that I make, or at least which evidence my bias, are that information services should not be an elitist enterprise to a small defined group of people but include -- and I think the Commission has given evidence of its view in their way -- will include all members of the population in some way. In addition to this, I have a heavy concern, as you know, toward solving some of these problems of service and access through regional, interstate cooperation; and we will have further statements to make through Dr. Alan Ferguson this afternoon, who is

RAG CONTENT

the Director of the parent organization under which NELINET functions, namely, the New England Board of Higher Education.

In your questions which you mailed out to us sometime back that were sent previous to our submission of written testimony, the question of Why is Federal Legislation Needed? it appeared to me that the provision of money to local libraries from federal sources should carry some further caveats than ever existed in previous legislation, and that is so that such resources which may be purchased with federal money be available through open access or interlibrary loan as a precondition to the nation's users.

I do put an intermediate step in there or a qualifier which may be closer to reality than the general goal of open access to everyone, and that is defined: "Users" should be user population, which should be carefully defined for each library so that we know the extent to which public access or open access is possible; and, two, interstate organizations which have firmly committed goals toward resource-sharing beyond the capability of any single state should receive high priority in support formulae.

There are two such organizations in New England with varying missions. One is the New England Board of Higher Education NELINET program, and the other is the New England Library Board, which I think you will hear more

Hemlock

about today.

Evidence of commitment to national standards within these contexts -- for instance, bibliographic standards -- should be an a priori condition for such funding for two reasons, I feel.

The first is obviously that it will facilitate national network development and coordination, if and when it comes, and I am convinced it will come; and it also by extrapolation imposes similar standards within the interstate region itself that comprises the agency administering these funds.

As to the inequities in today's systems, my initial response is one of kind of sidestepping the issue by saying that I don't know what the system is today, and I still really don't know, but I will go out on the further limb and say in general that access is discriminatory -- "access" here meaning the ability of a member of the general population to get whatever he wants, wherever, when he wants.

It is quixotic and, therefore, not really predictable by users whether or not they can get the same kind of service in one city or one school public library, et cetera, as they could in another, and this is particularly a problem because of population mobility and the expectations that are built as people move.

With respect to the question of user distance, which has been raised in another context, too, notably, in your draft document, the assertion that such access or use of library sources should be distant, independent is a principle under which NELINET operates at least as far as the sharing of telecommunications cores are concerned, and it has been received without question. The payment for making such activities distant, independent has not been questioned, even though on the surface of it, it appears to be inequitable.

Within the context of what reasons compel the government to consider interconnecting the libraries and information centers of the nation according to a national plan, the obvious answer occurs quickly to me, which is that for optimizing the sharing of resources is more than just an arbitrary political area, but it does relate to tying together of such regions, I think has to be carefully protected. I think recent history in such connection is: Federally funded or supported or controlled, the connecting systems should require political candid guidance and advocacy so that such legislation and funding relating thereto cannot be arbitrarily withdrawn, thereby leaving such a national system in a bit of a quandary.

As to the responsibilities of the federal government toward developing a national network, I think the analogy of information highways, that is, telecommunications switching protocols and such things which occur necessarily between electronically connected networks, is an area that must be addressed at that level. There are groups beginning -- there is one called the Council of Regions, which is nationwide, but very restricted in its membership at this point; it is made up of groups that have some kind of alliance at this point with the Ohio College Center Library Systems and, therefore, its purview is limited.

I am concerned about the work of this group because the context in which it operates is not agreed upon even by the participants in that group. If you want to know more about it, I will be glad to answer questions.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Miller, I think we ought to get to the question. I just wanted to ask you one question. You make the point that building a federal or a national system the federal component ought not to be such that the regions or the states become dependent upon it; and if it were withdrawn, it would cripple the system. Well, I find it pretty hard to imagine a system where there was a federal input which wouldn't cripple the system if it were withheld because the federal part of this is likely to be functional as well as just in amounts of money; they are going to be services and functions that depend upon the federal level. With the withdrawal, it is likely to cripple it. I don't know that you can avoid it.

MR. MILLER: Well, then it should be carefully understood by the participants in this that that is a likelihood. What that does is increase costs in the short and continuing run because people will necessarily want to have backup systems which are local in nature, I assume. We can see this in NELINET now: if a system goes down, for instance, and they cannot provide service for a particular length of time, they are affected and could be crippled --

CHM. BURKHARDT: So you think that safeguards should be provided?

MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I am afraid you cannot always avoid the possibility of that happening. Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: I want to ask you what essentially was going to be a negative question, and that is: You are involved in a great deal of interstate cooperation and institutional cooperation; and what we are doing, we are looking at possibly a mandate to work more in cooperation across state lines. What I want to ask you is: What are the pitfalls that we have to watch out for and where will the basic resistance come from?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Lerner, you are asking this in the context of interstate cooperation?

MR. LERNER: That's right, or an inter-institutional cooperation.

MR. MILLER: It is a complex question but a very important one. The pitfalls are that in some sense it is revealed in the draft document that you distributed. I think the Commission is viewing its pattern of support through the federal service and state service and there is no intermediary level. There has been at least no mention of such political entities being a named or viable source for this kind of activity. This makes us a little uneasy, I must say.

The pitfalls, I think, are attitudinal and in the area of governance -- attitudinal in the sense of local autonomy being viewed as lost to some degree. I think it is a mistake to assume that local autonomy is not lost.

The second point, that financial resources are allocated to a facility outside a local institution, that reduces to some degree the local autonomy or ability to use that money for their purposes. There is, I think, a feeling of this.

In other cases, I think there is a feeling of general fear of change or uneasiness about change when the future is so uncertain, and these are in the attitudinal level and these are by far, I think, the greatest barriers that we have encountered.

The governance area addresses itself to the question: If I join a network or consortium or group, what say do I have in what that group does to me or does to other people? How much of a commitment do I have to make? The larger the -- when a commitment gets beyond the level when it can't be hidden in an existing budget item, that is when the problems begin with respect to the internal institution, because all of a sudden it appears as a line item and, therefore, it can be dropped possibly.

T2 In general, I think the specialties that exist in libraries, such as special libraries, research libraries -- I make a special point of that; I think their problems are viewed as different orders of magnitude and, therefore, the pooling of cooperative enterprises between vastly dissimilar libraries -- in some cases it is said that this is really not what our enterprise is all about, and I think that goes counter to the general thrust of what I believe and what the Commission feels its mission is as well. But there are other areas, yet those occur to me quickly.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: I would like to get your guidance on this question and I hope you can illuminate it.

As I look into the future on networking, I see a difficulty arising where, in order to create the kind of function we are searching for, we are creating a political or a politically-oriented community throughout the states that in turn would be monitored by a federal group. Since funds would be involved, there would have to be this kind of organization. So we see the establishment of an overhead requirement in order to achieve our goals, and you rightfully have pointed out that there are some dangers involved along this line; but nevertheless if we want to reach sharing of resources and interconnections, something must be done.

How far would you go then in superimposition of a political superstructure in order to accomplish this end which you would advocate?

MR. MILLER: I only know one end of the continuum, to answer the question of how far. I know nothing is zero, but what the other end is -- I assume merger of all states -- or where the other end of the scale is in terms of the political state or overlay, I think your first instinct as a group to work through existing political entities is a reasonable way to go. The thing I am concerned about is that at the state level there are different orders of investment in library operations and when you say -- or library support -- and when the draft paper asserts that responsibility for local, in the sense of state, financial support must be forthcoming to match the federal contribution on some kind of formula basis, I think you willprobably run through the same kind of problems that have occurred with other programs where such monies were allocated in different ways, because they were not earmarked as well.

I do say though that there is good reason to interpose yet another overhead level, namely, the regional area, and I have already said this and I think you know my position on it. It does take overhead, but at this point the relationship of our regional organization to the state library agencies who would administer money is not clear at all. We do not pass money to them; they do not pass money to us directly.

What they have done in some cases, and I think this is a notable pattern which has grown, is that this affords the local regional libraries to do certain things, and the things that those local regional libraries would want to do is to participate in the network, so in that sense we get it directly. I don't see it as a widespread pattern, but it is not one that does not threaten some political autonomy from existing political institutions.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We will take time for one more question.

Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: Mr. Miller, for a number of years you have had the experience in receiving Library Construction Act funds in New England. How have you been spending the LCA funds?

MR. MILLER: Do you mean the region?

MR. CASEY: Yes.

MR. MILLER: I think that is a question that should best be addressed to the representatives of the Compact administrators, the interstate Library Compact Administrators/the New England Library Board as opposed to myself. We are not administrators of that money.

MR. CASEY: Do you have some experiences that you can relate from the various states though?

MR. MILLER: Well, I can give some examples as

ERASABLE

to where some of these monies have been allocated. It will only be partial, however.

The funding of teletype networks which, when withdrawn, may or may not be assumed as a cost of the participating libraries. This has occurred, I know, in at least one state, at least three states; others have gone to intrastate regions for purposes of promoting cooperation. I am talking now about Title 3 primarily. But very little has gone to support interstate activity, even though that was one of the uses to which this money could be put, and there is a good reason for this.

The state library agency primarily, principally is the state, and that is legislatively mandated; and if they can do anything more than that, it has got to be shown that the data describe some benefit from it. That is an incomplete answer, and I think there are others that I will be able to give you a much clearer answer on than I have on this.

MR. CASEY: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Let's move on now to Ms. Muriel Tonge, president of the Maine Library Trustee Association.

Would you like to begin with amplifying your statement?

Hemlock

MS. TONGE: Yes.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, as I said, the problems in Maine, as you heard in New Hampshire, I guess, reflect its own population and geographic situation. Only 80 percent of the people are now served by public libraries. We have recently passed new legislation creating a regional library system; this has not been implemented yet. In fact, it just becomes effective today.

But I think our goal is the same as is presented in your draft for national legislation, equal access. Our program seems to mesh very well. The means of setting a national program up seem a little forbidding at this time, but I think we are ready for it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ms. Tonge, I noticed in your paper you seem to indicate that federal support is needed in Maine for service to the handicapped for bookmobiles and that kind of service.

MS. TONGE: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Why do you think that that is particularly for federal support rather than regional or interstate support? Is there any reason why you would ascribe that as proper as a need for federal money?

MS. TONGE: Well, we, because of our rural population rely heavily on bookmobile service. Now half of our bookmobiles are federally supported and half of the service would have been terminated with the loss of federal funds, and I do not think they could have been picked up with state money or would have been.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Are not those services in fact going to be terminated?

MS. TONGE: I hope not.

CHM. BURKHARDT: As a result of the suspension of the --

MS. TONGE: Yes, half of the bookmobile service.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any questions? Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: I am particularly interested in one item which I think that you think is of some importance, regarding the cooperation between school and public libraries. From bitter personal experience where I am involved in libraries, the cooperation is plus or minus zero percent. How do you think that a federal commission could offer such resolutions or, on a local level, the cooperation, I would assume, in most areas today is minimal?

MS. TONGE: I don't know. We have not had much success with it so far and I just hope that you might be able to come up with something. The division seems to be getting greater.

MR. LERNER: What would you like us to do?

What I am really asking is: Should we lay on the schools and the libraries and say, "You must cooperate to this and that extent"? That is, the curriculum must go to the libraries and they have to get the books. What would you have us do?

MS. TONGE: Suggest that -- I do not think you can ever say "must" to them because they do not react well to that. I do not know. Under this national agency that you are proposing, would you include school libraries, for instance? We are hoping to initiate local cooperation under our new library legislation, hoping that it will start on really a local level. That would be their first point of cooperation, locally, between the school and public library, hopefully.

MR. LORENZ: Can you tell us how Maine librarians and trustees look upon their cooperation with the other New England states? Do you feel that this kind of cooperation on a regional basis is one answer to improve library service?

MS. TONGE: Yes.

MR. LORENZ: And could you tell us what forms you feel that cooperation should take?

MS. TONGE: Access to resources. We are rather limited where we cannot find something in the state, where we have to resort to mailings and out-of-state libraries are not always terribly cooperative on loaning materials.

MR. LORENZ: Do you think it should be done on a reimbursable basis?

MS. TONGE: I don't know. Probably.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Are there provisions in your new legislation for stimulating and getting started new cooperative programs within the state?

MS. TONGE: Well, the libraries are joining the system on a voluntary basis but are asked to state what kind of cooperative effort they mean to make in return for this. They get state aid, direct state aid on ten cents per capita basis, so we anticipate that they will all be joining the system to receive it.

MR. BECKER: There was no such formula before?

MS. TONGE: No. They received a small amount of state aid; it amounted to $20,000, I think, throughout the state. There was no per capita direct state aid.

MR. LORENZ: Can you comment on the use of revenue-sharing funds in Maine?

MS. TONGE: I don't think it has been used for libraries to any extent at all.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Velde.

MR. VELDE: I was just wondering -- you

mentioned about the national level to encourage the impact of the library locally. Do you have any special way that you feel that you can be helped federally to get more money locally?

MS. TONGE: Just in improving the library image.

MR. VELDE: Not with publicity but with a program of some kind?

MS. TONGE: Publicity and programs should go together, and publicize the programs which you are presenting.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: What are library trustees doing in Maine to improve the status of libraries financially and otherwise?

MS. TONGE: Well, they were active in supporting this legislation and helpful in getting it passed. They now are working locally to encourage their own libraries to join the system. Joining the system is a decision to be made by the local boards in each case.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Stevens.

MR. STEVENS: Can you tell me what the status is of professional libraries in Maine? We heard what the general situation is in New Hampshire, and I have visited in Maine and I know that, as in many states, there is a wide difference between the libraries in the rural community and those in some of the cities, and towns, and I wondered if that is reflected too in the fact that many Maine public libraries do not have professional library workers. Do you have any knowledge of that that would help the Commission?

MS. TONGE: Many of them do not have professional librarians and could not under their present financial setups; and with the new legislation, it merely asks them to move in the direction of meeting standards. We did not feel that there was ever a possibility of many of these libraries, which are open mainly maybe four hours a week, ever meeting standards. In fact, only two libraries in the state do now meet standards, and this is because of lack of professional help.

MR. STEVENS: I was called by a librarian in New Jersey recently who had asked if we could provide information that would show that a library in a community raises the level of the property tax value, brings industry to town, generally creates more revenue than it would spend; and I wonder, if the Commission were to develop the data that would show that a library in a town or city brings in more revenue than it could possibly spend, that then the towns in Maine could bring their libraries up to standard?

MS. TONGE: They would certainly move in the direction of raising standards. I think this has been shown with education, has it not, if they have improved their schools?

MR. STEVENS: Yes, it has.

MS. TONGE: There has been more interest in local tax support. The base has been raised.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Ms. Tonge. We will go on to the next witness, which is Ms. Marylou Blecharczyk.

Did I pronounce that word correctly?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Beautifully. In fact, I am quite accustomed to coming on a first-name basis and eliminating the last.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, if you want to start off with questions right away or if you would like to amplify your statement that you submitted, please decide on that now.

MS.MOORE: How about identifying Marylou for the rest of us? What is her position?

CHM. BURKHARDT: She is from the City of East Providence. You tell us what you do.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Well, in my spare time I am the Assistant Mayor of the City of East Providence, the first woman on the Council, now selected at large.

My area of expertise is not specifically libraries. However, I think I would qualify as far as a grass roots representation and "a lay person."

CHM. BURKHARDT: Good, thank you.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: A user of libraries and a part-time funder.

In listening to the testimony, some of the questions and the answers were especially interesting to me because I was concerned about the policy paper which had been sent recently. I was appalled actually because the entire thrust of the policy paper to me seemed to indicate the point of view the technical expertise which I object to.

Libraries, as I said in my written testimony, serve a tremendous function as an educational opportunity for enrichment; but again I did refer to the phrase "a captive audience." People are compelled by business and education to use these facilities. This again goes for the academic libraries for which I have great respect. We have some tremendous facilities in Rhode Island and I have used them personally; but the thrust of the policy paper seemed to me to indicate that this was where the federal funding and the impact and impetus would go.

I feel very strongly --

CHM. BURKHARDT: I am sure we didn't mean to create that impression, but if the paper gives that impression,we ought to fix it.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: I would appreciate that very much. It could make coming up here worthwhile, but I was especially interested in the lack not only in the policy paper but also in the lack here of the representation from the average, ordinary user because basically every bit of money you are going to spend does come from the rest of us; so rather than see the federal funding come down to a narrow group, I would rather have it go up, funnel up.

Now, to me this makes basic, common sense because what you are doing with your technical material, which is tremendous and which is needed -- your network systems, your computerization, the interrelationships, the regionalization -- this kind of thing is tremendous, but it is limited.

The effective use of this kind of technical information in the future is still going to have to come from the grass roots people who may not be reached now.

Let me give just a little specific example. East Providence is the sixth largest city in Rhode Island. We have a very diverse ethnic grouping. One of our problems is that of our over 52,000 population, about 15,000 are registered library users. We have a good system. We fund it. Our circulation is increasing. We are sustaining financial support. However, in going door-to-door campaigning, I found very few people, the average, ordinary person, aware of our five local libraries. This did disturb me since I am education-oriented.

I also realized from my personal experience and observation that many of these are the people who need the library from the standpoint of educational enrichment. I am thinking specifically of one family where it is a family of seven and the parents both are Portugese speaking. The father speaks English fairly well. Of their five children, three of these, through the use of the library, I assume, and the public school system have gone on to do tremendously well [illegible] the National Merit Boards. They won scholarships to Wellesley, in one instance, Brown in another, and a third chose to go to State University.

Now, basically I think what I am trying to say that this core of the grass roots population eventually will funnel up to your technical expertise, but I would be very disturbed if it works the other way down. This is of special concern to me.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I think we should get on with the questions. Maybe, Joe, you would like to comment on this disturbing interpretation of our paper.

MR. BECKER: I think there is an emphasis in the document, as you point out, on such things as interconnection with the establishment of new national services and in the expansion of old national services. But I think it represents a different philosophy of federal investment in libraries.

In the past we have had categorical aid going to the states, the states doing with the money what they could at the grass roots level, and the federal government merely providing that channel.

What is suggested here is the creation of a hierarchy of national services that could benefit everyone, with the state assuming responsibility in some measure -- undefined in the document at the present time, since it is such a useful one, but with the states providing support for a great deal of local services -- the object being that you'd find things growing from the bottom up as well as from the top down.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: May I ask a question?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Why would you prefer doing it through the state level rather than directly to the local level as part of the federal revenue-sharing?

MR. BECKER: Well, I think the way in which the federal-state partnership has operated up to now is that there is a relationship between the federal government and the state, whether it is for convenience or, I assume, even more -- because of the establishment of existing governmental relationships, leaving it to the state to work with the local level, sort of a pyramid arrangement; and that happens with all kinds of federal funding, in highways and so forth.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: But again you are thinking of it as two-level, federal and state, rather than three-level, local, state and federal.

MR. BECKER: No. I think there is a fourth level, and Ron Miller mentioned it before, and I think it is not clearly expressed in the document at the present time; but it is federal, it is regional, it is state and it is local, and somehow or other there has to be some kind of relationship between those four levels that would provide some homogeneous growth, and that is really what we are after, I think.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Thank you.

MR. LORENZ: I think there is another philosophy at work here, and that is just as with education and schools, libraries are basically a state responsibility; and if you are going to get statewide planning for library development, you need to establish your strength at the state level to get that planning and funding responsibility. And, as Mr. Becker has indicated, there has been a traditional relationship between the federal and the state level funneling funds down to the local communities to get the statewide planning and development.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: How much revenue-sharing did the City of East Providence receive last year?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Oh, we received just short of a million dollars for 1972 and just short of the same amount for 1973.

MR. LERNER: How much of that went into libraries?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: $25,000 from the 1972 funds.

MR. LERNER: Certainly not a significant amount.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Significant in comparison with our user population, and we are one of the few communities, I think, in the State of Rhode Island who did allocate money for the libraries.

MR. LERNER: Why in fact didn't the library, you know, get maybe a certain percentage greater than that? Do you think that libraries should be more active and vocal in the political marketplace?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Mr. Lerner, this is the crux of my feeling, yes. At one of the initial meetings we had in Rhode Island on federal revenue-sharing, at that time the expression or the feeling of Rhode Island was that physically libraries are not visible, they are not reaching people beyond the captive consumer, that there is no political clout for libraries. This is a basic fact, and when you have a political clout and people care enough, you get this kind of feedback, you will get this kind of pressure.

Now, in East Providence also we had allocated this $25,000 and this went basically for a new roof, you know, this kind of situation, it went for maintenance expenses. When this discussion came up, $20,000 was cut. Now wait. It was cut. I did bring along sort of a breakdown of our proposed budget that we have allocated and we have increased every year to approximately $230,000 for the support of our library units. Of this, the bulk of it, over $180,000 was salaries, Blue Cross, Social Security, pensions.

Okay? What was cut from this budget was $20,000 for books.

Now, to me what good is having a staff if they don't have something to work with? In the future we hope to cut down on staff work by processing record people through our municipal cooperative data processing operations so that they would have an outreach kind of situation. But don't be concerned; we are cutting our school budget proportionately because they had received an allocation of $30,000 for school books which do not filter into the public system, and we are providing or hope to put back the $20,000 that was cut because it is a minimum amount.

MR. AINES: I notice on the last page of your document you talk about the "noble state of Massachusetts," and as a person who was born and brought up here, I appreciate that.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Well, we do share many activitities and have much historical background in common.

MR. AINES: I am rather delighted to hear that you had conducted a march through the district to find out how people really feel about our libraries and what they know. You make the point that the library services are not geared to serve the average grass roots persons but really a selected group of natural readers and others, and your concern is that the average person somehow participates in the library world but not library activities.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Yes.

MR. AINES: Assuming that you have all the money that you want and all the facilities that you seek, are you going to be able to bring that community in to use your libraries?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Mr. Aines, we would shake up the traditional, and this is not a dirty word, "traditional," but we would so shake up the traditional system in East Providence that we would be able to bring the non-user into it.

I think one of the other points I mentioned is the market survey to actually find out what the user and non-user want, which is a very fundamental thing,because you have areas of expertise. I have been very interested in the testimony which has been given, but, you know, you can become very one-sided, you know, in this field. You think you know the people using the libraries, but I would think in terms of, you know, just some "druthers": If I had all the money, I would druther think in terms of disposable library materials, a one-use kind of thing. No one can convince me that people don't want to read. When you see the paperback books in every supermarket, well, there is where the people are and this is the place to go, and in drugstores. Where do people congregate? Schools could be a prime source. This is another area.

You know, as far as providing physical facilities to make people combine school and public libraries, this is one kind of thing, of disposable or single-use material which is inexpensive, and they can get in the habit, and people need it, so why not in shopping centers.

Again, in our particular context, where it is an educational opportunity for our ethnic groupings, there is one big flaw: You can read all the words you want. If you don't know how these words are pronounced, you are going to stumble quite often. I think there should be more coordination between both the visual and the oral.

T3 This would be of special help for the way we do have the language barrier. There are people who can read the words, know what they mean, but have never said them aloud. This is a very little thing but very important to the individual. This is the kind of thing.

Now, again we have a slight problem in that until mass transit is really developed, we need to have the library facilities not necessarily in a prime building but library opportunities within walking distance, because if you limit it to an area or if you regionalize it where you need transportation, you immediately eliminate the families, because no matter how many two-car families there are, there are more one-car families and this is used during the day by the male gentleman and it eliminates from activities the use of a library, which generally should be the prime areas, and it eliminates the family use. These are very simple things.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: I would like to make a comment on what you just suggested. I think it is a matter of techniques that your local libraries could create. If they could create a lot of interesting programs to suit the public interest for different levels of people, such as the senior citizens program, the children's program and others and programs for young adults, to sort of motivate the public's reading interest, and also I would suggest that you could get up a very good public relations program to publicize your library program and services.

Do you think that will help?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Well, Mrs. Wu, we had this past year over 150 programs and these were very well attended. Over 3,000 men in the community did participate in one way or the other. We do have a very active library group. It is one we are proud of, very proud of, so we have tried many of these approaches. It is just a case of more and having the mobility and the fluidity financially to accomplish this.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Dunlap.

MR. DUNLAP: In your statement you call attention to the fact that some of the colonial records in Rhode Island are in the noble state of Massachusetts. I am not trying to put you off, but there is another federation to deal with such matters, and this is the National Historical Publications Commission.

But regardless of that, I would think the Rhode Island Historical Society located in Providence would be interested in this and would want to have copies made simply to preserve them, even though they are well-housed now.

Have you explored this?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: I have not personally. However, we have established a bicentennial commission in East Providence and we are working with commissions from Seekonk and Rehoboth, and here again we come into the area of lack of common funds.

In East Providence we are prepared to provide the matching funds for federal grants, state grants, but in Massachusetts you have a different concept; they do not have matching funds. Now, this is an area that I consider important for state and federal because you can overlap, it is right there, and it is something that the individual communities cannot do. We have explored it in the sense --

I know that work is being done to preserve state records, there is progress in this direction, but I feel this specific area probably our State Director of Library Services could be more responsive on that.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I will give Mr. Casey the last question.

MR. CASEY: You have developed the point that library services are not geared to the average grass roots person. Now, this may be a situation varying with localities. In addition to your regular library building and its established branches, some communities have established storefront libraries, they have books distributed by mail, bookmobiles and things of that nature, so it does depend upon the local initiative in terms of how far you go into the neighborhoods in certain areas of your communities to deliver library services.

Now, I presume you brought this to our attention feeling that the federal government should further stimulate this matter of bringing books to the average grass roots person. If you wanted federal assistance, federal funding, what is your feeling in terms of federal guidelines, federal controls? If you will address that, would you say if you wanted us to provide the funds, you will have bookmobiles and you will have books by mail?

MS. BLECHARCZYK: I think, Mr. Casey, my thrust in indicating that is to indicate that, and that communities will vary, and I would hesitate to go with categorical grants. I think it should be block type of grant and left to the discretion of the local communities because needs vary. I agree completely with you on this.

Well, the local communities are so diverse that what is good for one maybe absolutely horrendous for another; so money, fine, you know, get it back to us; but don't tell us generally or specifically -- generally, yes, but not specifically it should be used for this, this or this, because there has to be enough reliance upon the local situation and local officials and the local librarians, the public librarians, to know what is needed in an area.

MR. CASEY: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

MS. BLECHARCZYK: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Our next witness will be Mr. Douglas Bryant, Director of Libraries at Harvard University.

You did not have a chance to present any written testimony, so would you care to lead off with a brief statement?

MR. BRYANT: Yes. I wish to thank Mr. Burkhardt and the Commission for this opportunity to appear before you.

While I, of course, recognize that the charge of the Commission is necessarily almost limitless in scope, I naturally approach the question of national library development from a particular point of view: That of the very large, encyclopedic library of record whose primary mission is to support advanced research and scholarship.

I hope that we may all assume that some sort of national network of libraries and information centers is not only a vital necessity but a prospect that may be envisaged as a practical possibility.

Proceeding from this assumption, I should like this morning to devote my remarks to this subject with emphasis on the singular place of large research libraries in American patterns of scholarship and research.

The designation and support of what might be called "national network collections" as a federal government responsibility is a fundamental, indeed, it seems to me, an essential element in any nationwide library program. Yet the practical and political problems inherent in this proposition are obviously of the utmost difficulty. It seems clear that within some general library institutions there are special collections that contribute uniquely to the national purpose. (I think here of collections like the Bancroft Library of the University of California, perhaps the outstanding collection in the history of the West; the Clements Library in the University of Michigan, a remarkable library of materials, particularly concerned with the American Revolution from the British point of view), , libraries, with themselves to be designated as national collections.)

But I am also firmly of the opinion that some entire libraries should also be further designated -- libraries like those of Yale and Harvard and the New York Public Library, that serve in truth as national libraries and whose national contribution derives precisely from the encyclopedic character of the totality of their collections.

Such libraries contain vast, systematically arranged world-wide collections of published materials of every kind, including books, periodicals, journals of scientific and humanistic institutions and societies, official government publications, newspapers, maps, sound recordings, video tapes, microfilms, and bibliographic and textual information in computer-based data banks.

These libraries also hold thousands of collections of manuscripts extending through the whole of the history of man from his earliest writings through medieval illuminated manuscripts to the correspondence, manuscripts, archives, and other papers of statesmen, literary figures, scholars, corporations, and every kind of individual and organization.

Quite apart from their collections, these libraries, in their various catalogs, have great bibliographical instruments of importance to students and scholars throughout the country.

The continuous growth of these libraries and the consolidated development of their bibliographic apparatus are matters of paramount concern to the future of research and scholarship in America.

Ways must and will be found to make the holdings of these libraries more readily accessible to researchers throughout the country. In this effort reliance will have to be placed on the easy availability of bibliographic information for locating specific materials, as well as on the continuing breadth and depth of the collections themselves.

It may well prove to be both administratively sound and politically attractive for much of the federal funding for national library network to be channeled through state governments. Within any such scheme, there is a rather special question that should be most carefully considered. It is a notable American phenomenon that many of the largest and finest libraries have been built over the centuries under non-government auspices. These private institutions include such general collections as the New York Public Library and the libraries of the great private universities, as well as outstanding independent special collections such as the Folger, Huntington and Newberry Libraries.

Indeed, in several states (for example, in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York) most of the major research libraries are private institutions. Thus, foolproof means will have to be devised to insure that appropriate federal government support for these libraries does in fact reach them and under terms that will most effectively promote their national purposes.

Special consideration must, of course, be given to the central role of the Library of Congress in any form of national library network. The establishment of a National Bibliographic Center in the Library of Congress is an absolute necessity that is long overdue.

The Commissioners may recall that this was a major recommendation of the original Committee on Research Libraries of the American Council of Learned Societies in its report to the special Presidential Commission that was your predecessor. This National Bibliographic Center would be the central source of bibliographic information pertaining to the holdings of all libraries in the country, and

Hemlock

particularly it would provide a means of insuring that information on materials not acquired by the Library of Congress is incorporated in the National Bibliographic data bank.

With respect to the Library of Congress as a lending agency, I would remind the Commission that, while the Library of Congress is de facto, the National Library, it has a priority clientele in the Congress and other agencies of the federal government.

This being the case, I doubt that it would be practical to think of that Library as being fully effective as a lending library of last resort.

For much early printed material and for ready access to all kinds of research materials, an effective national network will, I believe, have to provide for a strong central collection of materials assembled primarily to provide the needs of scholars across the nation.

The Center for Research Libraries is, of course, just such an institution that should play a prominent part in a national network.

In closing, I should like to underscore the concern I have expressed, and which I believe we all must share, for maintaining the strength of the large research libraries, many of them private institutions, as we work toward the creation of a National Network of Libraries and

Information Centers.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Bryant.

I would like to ask you: You say the Library of Congress ought to be the place for the National Bibliographic Center. Is there any alternative to that?

MR. BRYANT: None that I can think more practical.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Can you think of any practical alternative?

MR. BRYANT: Not that I can think of from what develops among groups of librarians, consortia of various states. It seems to me the Library of Congress will remain the hub of the Center of the Bibliographic enterprise of the nation.

CHM. BURKHARDT: John, would you like to ask a question?

MR. LORENZ: Yes. In terms of the alternative for a national lending service, would you acknowledge that the resources of the Center for Research Libraries would have to be enlarged tremendously in order to serve this function?

MR. BRYANT: Oh, tremendously.

MR. LORENZ: At considerable cost in doing this?

MR. BRYANT: Yes.

MR. LORENZ: You feel this would be a better alternative than to enhance the copying facilities of the materials either at the Library of Congress or at other libraries, because in many cases the materials that we are talking about are unique materials which may only be in one library in the country?

MR. BRYANT: I think --

MR. LORENZ: Would you comment on this?

MR. BRYANT: Yes. I think in answer to that question, John, it seems to me in no case are we dealing with the monolithic situation. The Library of Congress cannot,and certainly the Center for Research Libraries could not do it now as one which was integrated, no matter how it was increased in scope and size, and two could not do it all. I think it is wherever the research has been banded together; ergo, it is the network requirement.

It seems to me some sort of central -- and I say "central" rather than a series of regional collections -- ought to be developed in one form or another to provide ready access either directly to materials or to copies of materials. I am not distinguishing here between those two and simply an agency -- call it the Centers for Research Libraries, if you would like -- whose primary responsibility and purpose is not through a collection whose primary responsibility is either something else or to some other clientele; but I think the materials in every resource library have got somehow or other to get into the moving stream of information.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Dunlap.

MR. DUNLAP: Mr. Bryant, we certainly would agree with you that we have responsible and, indeed, identifiable source collections and we must assist in their support, but then this implies wider use. I want to put to you the difficult question: As head of the largest university library in the country, can you face up to larger use and can you face inevitable destruction of your collections?

The New York Public Library, with which I am intimately familiar, was the prospect here. Do you anticipate or do you need enough funds to provide duplicates? Do you need more funds? How can you backstop --

MR. BRYANT: If you are thinking of physical deterioration of materials, both transient and drastic -- are you thinking now of the personal traffic or traffic on the premises, so to speak?

MR. DUNLAP: Both, yes, from correspondence, people coming to you for collections and physical deterioration.

MR. BRYANT: Let's take physical deterioration.

You touched there, of course, one of the most sensitive and difficult problems I think the whole research establishment is involved with. There have been, as you know, a number of proposals, and undoubtedly there will be more, looking toward efforts of establishing an effective means of dealing with the problem of preservation of deteriorating materials in libraries.

We know that practically everything in the world has been printed in the last century or century and a half on poor paper of deteriorating character and major developments are taking place in the last two or three years looking toward schemes of arresting deterioration of materials now in existence.

It is incumbent upon everyone concerned with the existence of libraries and research to bring all the pressure to bear that we can manage on publishers to insure to the extent one can that current publications are printed on papers which do exist, which will be strong and durable and which will retard deterioration very considerably. This is a major concern clearly of the nation and, I should suppose, of the federal establishment. I see no other practical way of getting basically at this business of the preservation of materials without massive efforts of this sort.

Now all of the major research libraries I know anything about, certainly including Harvard, are doing what they can, but this is simply a drop in the bucket and a national scheme has got to be put into force. There is one excellent program that has been proposed by the Association of Research Libraries which, with some modification, ought I think to be most carefully considered by this Commission.

With respect to the traffic, the lending or copying, I think this is a matter that is largely,I like to think anyway, one of additional personnel to handle the clerical and bibliographic work involved. Perhaps larger laboratory facilities in terms of making copies of materials required elsewhere in the country. I don't see this as any major stumbling block in a library like Harvard, we are so helpful now in providing materials for scholars across the nation. With respect to larger use by people on the premises, this does create a whole separate problem and one wonders really how much increase there would be of that kind of use. It is already, you see, in a place like Cambridge so extensive, with scholars from all over the country, all over the world, indeed, I wonder if one ought to envisage necessarily a large increase in that kind of traffic. If it were large, it would certainly be a problem.

MR. DUNLAP: You think it would just naturally follow?

MR. BRYANT: Yes.

MR. DUNLAP: In summers?

MR. BRYANT: Oh, yes, it is now in summers.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ms. Wu.

MS. WU: You were talking about making the Library of Congress a bibliographic center. Would you suggest that the Library of Congress should duplicate the collections in the other national libraries, such as the National Library of Madison, the Agricultural Library? Would you suggest that the Library of Congress should have a complete collection, even though the other national libraries have their special collections?

MR. BRYANT: No, I would surely not advocate any such duplicality. That would seem to me not desirable.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: Falling in line with the last question, is it your view that the large encyclopedic libraries can infinitely increase their collections, that you feel that the regional approach that we are moving toward is an answer to that question?

MR. BRYANT: In some degree I am leary of the regional in some ways, because I think the location of the libraries in this country is so unsystematic, if you like; it is, of course, wholly a result of historical accident, if you please. I think that -- no, I think to start with that the large encyclopedias individually cannot continue to grow, shall we say, indefinitely. It is certainly true that the large such libraries that I know anything about are at this very period in their history acquiring, let us say, proportionately less of the potentially important research materials than they did 50 or 60 years ago. Certainly this is true at Harvard and equally of others.

It is, I think, through various kinds of collecting partnerships, consortias of a variety of kinds which now exist and which are being developed -- it is through this kind of partnership or collaboration, if you like, that we can keep this under control. The important thing is to be sure the materials are in fact acquired some place, that the location and identity are easily established in a proper geographic scheme and, thirdly, they are available broadly and generally, no matter where they are.

And that is the collection, I think, we are going to go to. I would be very leary of any involvement establishing a system of regional libraries because I think we would have an enormous amount of duplication of materials that would be so seldom used and that would be duplicated ten or twelve times across the country, it would be a clear waste of every kind of effort.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any other questions? If not then, thank you, Mr. Bryant.

We will come next to Mr. Rush Welter, Bennington College in Bennington, Vermont.

I hope you have not come all this distance just this morning. Have you?

MR. WELTER: No. I came by yesterday to use some of the libraries.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, would you like to start with some amplification of your paper which you have submitted, or would you want to go right into that question?

MR. WELTER: I am willing to make a couple of comments on the draft proposal you sent me, but otherwise I didn't summarize my remarks because I thought you were going to ask me questions.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Right. We read your paper. I thought you might want to amplify it, if you would like to , but if not, you can respond to the draft of this paper we have sent you.

MR. WELTER: Well, I recognize there are technical problems that I don't know much about, I suppose, and also that there are potential political considerations that enter into any discussion of national library service or system, but I think I would stress in response to the statement, the draft, one, is that what is wanted is a network of access, not simply a network of reference as to publications; second, I would come down very heavily on the proposition that what we need is improved catalogs and improved indexes of different kinds.

You know, it is a truism, but if you don't know that something exists or if it isn't cataloged in a suitable way, you just don't know about it unless you go through open shelves, which you cannot do in most libraries. Indeed, as I suggested in my initial remarks, there are a number of major research libraries that don't even know what they have; in some cases I know more than what they do about some small aspect of their collection, at any rate.

And, finally, I speak as an American intellectual historian particularly interested in the 19th century and particularly interested in popular attitudes, not elite attitudes.

I cannot stress heavily enough the need to reserve publications that are obviously ephemeral; that is to say, no scholar of philosophy would be interested in them.

They are ephemeral in that sense, also in the physical sense: the more popular they are, obviously the worse the paper they were printed on. Newspapers and tracts and things like that are simply disappearing because they cannot be used any more. They are also, I should add, exceedingly expensive.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Should we start with the questions then? Do you find when you are trying to do research at Bennington, which does not have a research library, that your work necessitates your traveling to various other centers?

MR. WELTER: Yes, it does. I am very lucky. The American Antiquarian Society is especially strong in things that I am interested in and the New York State Library also, so that I don't have to travel very far, but there are limitations on time and limitations on the kinds of use that I can put those materials to.

For instance, it is a small matter, probably not befitting a real scholar, but it would be nice if I could borrow things sometimes, but because I am not a resident of New York State, I must arrange to do all the work there or arrange an interlibrary loan.

T4

CHM. BURKHARDT: But the interlibrary loan could accomplish that?

MR. WELTER: Yes. I have had access to interlibrary loans. These, of course, would not be exceedingly rare books or that kind of publication. Also, a small library like Bennington College has some diffidence in asking for volume upon volume of anything, although the kind of thing I do involves a great many materials.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: You are the second or third person who has testified to one problem, and that is the refusal of some libraries to provide microforms or copies of materials. That is unique.

MR. WELTER: Yes.

MR. LERNER: I personally am appalled by that. Would you give us that rationale and how it affects you and other scholars?

MR. WELTER: Well, my sense is, for reasons that anyone can understand, that many of these excellent collections or excellent collections with respect to a particular state or particular region began as private hobbies, and when they were made publicly available they were still made available in more or less the terms of a private club. When one goes to almost any one of these collections, one in effect acquires membership in the club; but if one doesn't physically go there -- in one case, for example, I remember that the proprietor, if I can call him that, the head of the library, apparently suspected me of wanting to do an anthology or something like that and was very concerned that the physical exclusiveness of the material remain at the library rather than that I be able to reproduce it.

Well, I didn't intend to reproduce it. I was perfectly willing to agree to not reproduce it, but somehow or other I didn't make the club; I protested actually to Platt Carson(phonetic) at the Antiquarian Society and asked him to write me a letter.

Then the reason for not giving me the microfilm materials changed, but I still didnot get the microfilms.

I don't believe that answers your question, but --

MR. LORENZ: What has your experience been getting copies, photocopies, of the materials that you want from other libraries?

MR. WELTER: Reasonably good, except for the difficulties like this, and in this particular case, for example, I don't know whether you want me to use names or not. Does it matter to you?

CHM. BURKHARDT: You decide.

MR. WELTER: Well, a librarian in a large metropolis did not wish to make available its materials.

The librarian, I guess, talked to the librarian of the state historical library and the state librarian agreed to give me matters they held uniquely, but many of the copies they didn't hold uniquely were withheld otherwise by the library in the metropolis, with the result that they got two copies but I didn't see either.

MR. LORENZ: I was getting at a different aspect of the question. That is, whether you find the cost of getting copies prohibitive or possible.

MR. WELTER: No. It can become very costly, of course. For instance, the kinds of things that I am talking about were imprints listed in state listings of imprints; those are relatively inexpensive. If I wanted to have anything to do with newspapers, however, the cost would be prohibitive.

MR. AINES: I would like to read a statement that you made and ask you to amplify a bit on it.

You said, "I am concerned, however, with any area of popular education that seeks to accommodate the information process to the deficiencies of existing modes of inquiry rather than works to elevate those modes to the point at which the ordinary man can achieve a serious and, indeed, quasi-professional grasp of subjects he is interested in."

Then you go on to talk about the Jeffersonian rather than the Jacksonian approach. Would you eludidate a bit on that?

MR. WELTER: I must say it is not easy to do. That is, one can write a book about it, as I have, but my problem is that, as I suggested to you when I sent back my hasty memo in August, it seemed to me that much of the conversation that one hears about or reads about, say, in the New York Times having to do with library matters seems to presuppose that there is a set of bodies of knowledge resting on shelves somewhere and that the functional problem is to get those bodies of knowledge into the hands of users. I think that the manner in which one conceives knowledge has a good deal to do with the kind of structure of reference bibliographical materials that one would set up and that the object is not simply to be able to account physically for every title that anybody may have heard about or, for that matter, to provide specifically formed information, but to provide an arena or a place where a person can go and range around, make inquiry, find his way to points of view, interpretations that he didn't initially anticipate.

Now, beyond this we get into a whole theory of learning and education which, as I say, is a very large topic.

I don't know whether I have responded at all to what bothers you.

MR. AINES: If I understand you, you say you are concerned a little less about bibliographic material and more about the knowledge that you mean to acquire.

MR. WELTER: Well, I am less concerned about the mechanics of accessability and bibliographic listing getting in the way of the notion that these are raw materials for the use of the imaginative mind rather than quantitative pieces of information which, when made available, have done all that needs to be done.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You speak of many libraries having large gaps in the information they are able to provide you. You mean something more than just the bibliographical information?

MR. WELTER: Well, in this particular case, no. Again, to take the Antiquarian Society, which is probably the preeminent library for the period up to about 1875 in early American writings, I have recently been back there collecting quotes and other kinds of things in a manuscript that I have completed. I am now in a position in which I say I am pretty sure you have this somewhere. They have wracked their brains as to where it might be because the catalog doesn't show it, and yet I obviously have seen it, so thatliterally they don't know what they have; and this is why I say that the new Union catalog, or whatever it is called, is deficient. The same is true of other libraries.

Just to give an example, the other day -- I don't know how I found out about it initially, but I know that the Harvard Law School Library had a book from 1850, the Union Catalog at Harvard doesn't know it and, therefore, the new Union National Catalog did not know it.

This is what I am talking about -- the mere physical listing, if I can call it that.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Joe Becker.

MR.BECKER: Mr. Welter, on your phrase, "The process of inquiry," that intrigued me in your letter. From the professional librarian's viewpoint, the process of inquiry consists of the organization of materials on the shelves, the preparation of catalogs, the development of other tools about nature, the use of two-dimensional classification systems so that we can find things by subject, by author and by title.

The process of inquiry on the part of the scholar is the use of this apparatus and many other things, such as serendipity and other kinds of things to enable him to locate what he wants, and it is a detailed kind of thing.

What do you suggest can be done for improving things from a scholar's viewpoint?

MR. WELTER: I would be happy to ponder that and try to write some minutes on that. I can't answer right now in two minutes.

Because I think it is part of our conception, but it is a most difficult kind of problem to contend with.

MR. BECKER: And if you don't mind using your experience in giving us the benefit of your suggestions, we would certainly appreciate it.

MR. WELTER: Well, I will see what I can do. Of course, I have been teaching for 20 years or so, and I try to do the things in teaching of the things that forward the process of inquiry, so actually maybe I can say something of relevance to librarians.

MR. DUNLAP: What difficulties have you encountered in trying to find photocopies pertaining to particular collections?

MR. WELTER: In my case it is imprints that I would like to see in some cases, and the answer is no; in one case, the Alabama State Archives, there apparently is a large collection of pamphlets just before the Civil War by J. L. M. Curry in such bad shape that the microcopies cannot be made.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ms. Moore.

MS. MOORE: Mr. Welter, I am intrigued with your statement where you said that in general you find most of the attention paid by library experts to information retrieval questionable, and you have spent a little time writing on that, but I would like you to expand further if you would care to.

MR. WELTER: Well, I am not an expert in this. I can only report what my reactions are when I read the New York Times, which may or may not accurately reflect what the library people are talking about in their conventions or wherever attitudes like this are expressed, but for me at least, even the phrase "information retrieval" raises certain hackles for the kinds of reasons that I have suggested in responding to other people.

It is true, of course, that a librarian must necessarily think in terms of organization, accessability, physical placement; but maybe I am just an obsolescent man; my sense is that increasingly, as the technical problems of availability, the amount of publication increases, librarians are necessarily thinking only in these mechanical terms or, rather, that they can think only in terms of mechanical solutions. Once you begin thinking in terms of mechanical solutions, that you think all the problems are indeed mechanical, I think that what most humanists say about so-called computers generally and it is the same kind of protest. Again, all I can do is say that these are my prejudices as I read the accounts in the Times.

Now, I may wrong you --

MR. AINES: May I reassure you that there are many people in various groups, including federal government, that feel very much like you do, and that the idea is to provide the knowledge required to accomplish certain ends, whether they be in terms of scholarship, solution of human problems, solution of technological problems and virtually every other kind of an effort that requires intelligence, not given you necessarily always in bibliographic form.

But be reassured that there are many people that feel the same way.

MR. WELTER: Well, as I say, I entered that in my initial comments, I am not sure what was really going on but merely in that I am suspicious.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any further questions? If not, thank you very much. We appreciate your comments.

MR. WELTER: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Our next witness is Mr. Walter Brahm, State Librarian, Hartford, Connecticut. Mr. Brahm is not here, so can we go on then perhaps to Mr. Cronin, the Secretary of Educational Affairs to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

MR. CRONIN: Members of the Commission, may I make three major points:

1. The Federal Government has stimulated major advances in the extension of library services to forgotten populations--inmates of prisons and of hospitals, immigrants and bicultural citizens.

The withering away of Federal support at this time, however, is fatal. Many of these groups cannot or do not vote. Most cannot come to hearings -- the incarcerated, the handicapped, the speaker of another language. The programs are new and not in the front rank of the scramble for revenue-sharing funds, whether state or local.

Thus we need federal categorical aid -- for planning special projects, for seed grants, for renovation, for start-up costs, for evaluating and updating a comprehensive state plan. The aid should come to the state library and media agency best equipped to stimulate local, regional and institutional initiatives.

2. The Commission should provide encouragement and technical assistance to states which want to improve their capacity to respond to new clienteles and technological

developments in the libraries and information sciences.

Massachusetts has done remarkably well given a very fragmented organizational structure. We have a Board of Library Commissioners to help local and school libraries and regulate entry into the profession. We have a Board for the state library, our official State government Library. We have five higher education governing boards, all with different job titles and procedures for organizing library and media services. A sixth board in higher education helps by distributing money and by centrally processing the books for state college libraries. A seventh board does it for private colleges and public colleges elsewhere in New England. Two other councils make policy for instructional television and telecommunication while a new Cable TV Commission handles regulatory aspects.

Recently Governor Sargent proposed one board for higher education and one library and media board, the latter to pull together the two library boards and the two telecommunications councils into one. The Cable Regulatory Commission will remain a consumer affairs agency but wants to cooperate with those of us in educational and cultural affairs.

The Federal Commission can help us by recommending ways of organizing a state for effective coordination of information collection and retrieval and information services broadly defined. Just as HUD or DOT gives grants to develop comprehensive plans for organizing and delivering services, so should your Commission seek parallel resources for helping us organize library and related technologies.

3. The third admonition is to pursue agressively the new technologies that may revolutionize the concept of library services. Your program reports and other publications indicate that you know what a library is and are watching new developments with caution.

Give the nation leadership in telling us how Cable TV, the computer and the local library will work together to improve the services to every home and family.

Tell us how the new alliance between local libraries and the Open University is working out so that we can adjust our higher education policies to include local libraries.

Educate the President, the Congress and the nation about the potential of video cassettes, computer time-sharing, xerography, and the other developments beyond the multiple media services now offered by our libraries.

Our librarians tell me they are ready for the exciting future where the several technologies and the printed word will complement each other and not compete for attention. Help us define that vision and help us translate it into federal and state policies that preserve our library treasures while extending knowledge and enjoyment to the total citizenry.

T5 CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Cronin.

Your remark, about the incarcerated cannot come to public hearings, reminded me that in our Atlanta hearings we did have a prisoner in one of the state prisons come. He was serving, I think, three or four life terms consecutively, and the prison library was one of his major interests.

He made a very good witness, incidentally.

Well, if I may ask the first question: Does your office keep track of how revenue-sharing is working? Would you know fairly specifically how much revenue-sharing money is actually going into library support?

MR.CRONIN: Yes. Our Board of Library Commissioners has asked each local community, each local library, to report on how much money they have received, and they have been keeping a running account for the past six or seven months.

CHM. BURKHARDT: In general, what is the picture?

MR. CRONIN: Well, it is spotty, but the overall picture, I would say, is bleak. There have been some breakthroughs, and I know there have been reports at the end of the first six months, but we had only received about ten or twelve reports of where revenue-sharing funds to the local communities had been earmarked.

At the state level, about 90 percent of the revenue-sharing money, the general revenue-sharing money, went into reimbursements to local cities and towns for educational services, and I regret to say that very little of that went to library services.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: I think I have asked so many questions but you are a delightful target. Let me ask you this question: In your testimony you talk about federal categorical aid, among other things, for evaluating and updating a comprehensive state plan.

It would seem to me that Massachusetts, with its concentration of intellects scattered throughout the universities and elsewhere, might very well, without federal aid, at least begin to get the rudiments of such a plan.

Why would you expect us to encourage this with the use of federal funds when, if the needs are so great and the opportunities so rampant, why would this not be done, let us say, in doctoral theses at MIT or Harvard and a variety of other places? How much encouragement have you made to get some internal guidance of this type which in turn would be useful for the rest of the country?

MR. CRONIN: Well, right now, of course, using the LSCA funds, we each year have been developing a five-year plan and there is periodic evaluation of it.

What I am saying is that this is a terribly important thing to do. Yes, we have; we boast to more than our share of brain-power and library talent in this region, New England and in Massachusetts. However, most of it, probably 98 percent of it, is concentrated in an individual institution or an individual library.

What we need is help to achieve some of the goals that I know this Commission espouses, that of networking and linking together, making sure that we are not building libraries with similar collections one mile apart or even ten or a hundred miles apart, if we don't need to, if we can spread the resources farther.

Now, that is going to take a lot more than doctoral dissertation or an occasional scholar in library science sounding the alarm about some of the mistakes. We need sustained and persistent attention paid to it.

I call to mind the work we are asked to do by the federal government in vocational and technical education, where we are asked to link that to manpower training and we are asked annually to evaluate and update our plan. A prerequisite for sophisticated and advanced systems of information science and of sharing resources requires some stimulation, and it is more than that to which the graduate students or some scholars can do from time to time on an ad hoc basis or that any notion of this being a long-range commitment.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: Mr. Cronin, in preparing the statement, what mode of agency have you used? Are these personal thoughts that you have gained as State Secretary of Educational Affairs, or are you reflecting local public sentiment?

The reason I asked for that is, is there a public move for the things that you wish and that is translated to the Senators and the Congressmen? Of course, then we can respond to these things in terms of financing now and we can come up with suggestions and recommendations; and unless they are financed and become public policy, we will not be able to implement them. Do you believe there is a public sentiment for the kind of thing you are advocating in this kind of paper?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Could I repeat the question for the benefit of those who may not have heard?

Mr. Casey wants to know to what extent Mr. Cronin's position that he takes in his paper is his own personal one or as an expert in these matters, and to what extent it reflects public sentiment and needs and demands at the present time.

MR. CRONIN: Well, my work as Secretary of Educational Affairs involves reviewing the budgets and coordinating the activities of all these boards, councils, higher education, secondary, arts and humanities. This work takes me throughout Massachusetts. I have met with library officials on three or four occasions; I have visited some of our prison libraries as far as our regional library centers as well as other libraries, including the Boston Public Library, with its fantastic new addition to it.

So I have had a chance to talk with librarians and with trustees and from time to time with consumers to find out, you know, how they feel. What I find is that there is just the very beginning of an awareness of what a technology like cable TV can do for education and information sciences broadly defined, just the beginning of it. That is why the Commission, rather than wait for the flow of public support, has got to define what the potential is.

I found individual librarians and boards are committed to extending library services to the handicapped, to those in correctional institutions; however, the general public probably is not as aware of that as a priority as those of us who have the rare privilege of being in public service and having a statewide point of view or on some of these things.

I am really giving you the informed opinion of those in leadership positions, that these are areas that must be highlighted and where support must be generated.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: On your first point, you pointed out that the federal government should give categorical aid in order to serve the immigrants, bi-cultural citizens, those minority groups. Would you suggest that the aid should be indicated separately from the general funds which will be allotted to the library services?

MR. CRONIN: Let me respond by giving an example. We in Massachusetts last year passed a bilingual and bi-cultural education act where we specifically say we will reimburse communities,local school systems for the additional cost of providing services to populations such as Puerto Ricans, Portugese-speaking, Chinese-speaking and many other groups that we have in Massachusetts. You know, this is a clear case of specified categorical aid. I think it is Title 7 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts, which was put in to provide bilingual education to states with large concentrations.

So I think there are several precedents for it. The alternative would be to include it in a list of specific kinds of services that would be paid for by some Title in a piece of federal legislation, but I know this: that my awareness of a library for the Portugese-speaking people in New Bedford, a library in the south of Boston for Spanish-speaking people indicate that this is a very important need and we need stimulation and assistance.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: Mr. Cronin, in making your recommendation that the Commission provide grants for certain purposes, were you in effect recommending that the Commission become more of an operating agency than the present law foresees for the Commission?

MR. CRONIN: Well, I see you being in the dilemma that we are phasing out certain kinds of federal aid for library services, library construction, the Commission, I gather, has already been transformed once into a kind of short-range advisory group to now a Commission with somewhat larger responsibilities. I don't pretend to know what the next step is, whether it should be a commission or some other agency that you recommend or some unit within HEW -- whatever experts on federal government structures think best -- but I do see the need for sustained support, and I like some of the phraseology in your new draft document that talks about, you know, the counterpart of interstate highway.

I don't know if you know it, but in Massachusetts we are cutting back on our commitment to the building of interstate highways, cutting up our cities; we will be happy to use some of those funds for library and technology.

MS. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, may I comment?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes, Mrs. Moore.

MS. MOORE: I think that is a very admirable statement from a public official. In our part of the country, roads are paramount to everything, and I am so glad to have your testimony in that regard.

I wanted to ask a question, but you have indicated here that you think the state should take primary responsibility in planning; and since I agree with that point of view, I would like to get you to expand a little bit more on it.

How have you gone about coordinating the work of these boards? I see that you are moving toward eliminating two and perhaps giving a broader charge to those that remain.

MR. CRONIN: Yes. I think what I am really saying is two things. One, I believe the states -- the state is an appropriate unit for helping cities and towns and institutions develop as to some network. Naturally there are some things that ought to be done on a national level, other things that ought to be done on a New England regional basis; but I see the bulk of the responsibilities going to the states, and we think our state board has done a very effective job by making priority decisions on where should some of the federal funds go, where should some of the priorities for some of our state funds lie.

We are interested in getting jobs for the regions within the state to provide, to cooperate and provide services; we think we should be prepared to get additional federal funds in the future, in addition to state funds, to put our house in order, not to have so many different boards making library policy that may go in a different direction.

Now, that may contradict or contravene one another, so that is why I say -- or one recommendation or request I have is: Tell us and give us your impression of some of the states which are doing a particularly good job of orchestrating and planning for library services and related information technologies.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Cronin, for your testimony, indeed.

MR. CRONIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I think it was Mr. Brahm, the State Librarian from Hartford, Connecticut is here now. We had passed him over.

I would take it that you were obviously delayed by the weather.

MR. BRAHM: Well, good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission.

I wasn't delayed by the weather, but I hope I don't talk in circles this morning because I have been going around and around in the parking garage over here and I finally landed up on the ninth floor. So maybe by this time the cobwebs are out of my mind.

Well, in the brief testimony that I had previously submitted to the Commission, I advocated transferring the categorical library grants and service grants from the U. S. Office of Education to the Library of Congress, citing the inability of these grants and programs to command sufficient attention and competition with other programs involving vastly greater sums of money.

I want to further support this testimony by reporting how the library program has been shifted around in HEW like the proverbial orphan. It is not meant as criticism of the Department but is intended to show what difficulties plague a small program in a huge federal department.

Although current national funding for libraries is in doubt, it is still important that the Commission appraise the effectiveness of HEW's administration of such funding. Responsibility foradministering new funding formulas and service proposals made by the Commission will have to be assigned to a federal agency. I think it is very important which agency that he is assigned to.

Since 1968 -- only five years ago-- there have been at least six U.S. Commissioners of Education. The appointment of a seventh is now pending. The Office of Education is, of course, the unit in HEW in which the library programs have been assigned. The organizational status of the library in HEW has been changed frequently. As of January 1968, there was a Director of the Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities under an Associate Commissioner for the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Library Programs.

In 1969, the Division was reorganized as the Division of Libraries and Educational Technology. Currently it is assigned to an Associate Commissioner for Libraries and Learning Resources.

During these five years there have been four different Associate Commissioners in charge of the library program and a period during which the position was vacant. I submit this is no way to administer any program.

As the witness testified when asked what he thought when he saw two trains approaching a head-on collision, he said, "What a hell of a way to run a railroad," and I think this is true in terms of administering library programs.

Now, in contrast to these frequent changes in personnel and organization, there have been only 11 Librarians of Congress since its establishment in 1800, 173 years ago. Continuity with growth has been the record of this institution. It is the most dedicated of all federal agencies to libraries and information service.

The Commission's draft of "a new national program of library and information service" dated October 1973 cites the lack of a central authority to set information policy and questions where such authority should be placed.

A National Library Authority, in theory, appears to be an improvement, and could be, that such an authority operating outside of an existing library would lack the power to control any part of its basic raw materials and tools of its trade, which are books and materials. It always would be in the position of gate-crashing a stockholders' meeting -- not owning a share of stock -- advising your company(libraries) what is best for business.

However, if such authority is the Library of Congress, it then holds majority control of substantial library resources in the country for use in combination with money to effect the networks and systems of library service the Commission envisions in its proposal.

So I would hope that whatever authority is set up, that you seriously consider the Library of Congress as being that authority.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

John, I think we should give the first question to you since you know most about these matters.

MR. LORENZ: Well, the Library of Congress will do, of course, what the Congress of the United States asks it to do, which represents the will of the people, and we do recognize, however, the problem that you have indicated; that it is in the legislative branch, which historically has not assumed executive functions. But we also recognize the possibility that the change is in the nature of things and, therefore, we are not turning any deaf ear or blind eyes to such a possibility, but we do feel that this is something that the Congress directly would have to express its will on.

I might say that the strongest indication of moving in this direction has been in terms of the Library expanding upon its present services to the blind and physically handicapped, which presently is in the nature of materials and equipment, and replacing with money grants the present funds that have been in the Library Services and Construction Act, and which funds may disappear with the other LSCA grants and making up this by having grant funds appropriated to the Library of Congress to continue to support services to the blind and physically handicapped.

So this would be, you might say, the beginning of the kind of money grants that I think you are suggesting would emanate from the Library of Congress.

CHM. BURKHARDT: For those of you who may not have heard what Mr. Lorenz said in response to the testimony, it is that the Library of Congress has been making, doing somethings in the direction that Mr. Brahm recommends, particularly in the blind and handicapped area, but that any real increment in that would depend entirely upon Congress, and the Library is ready to do whatever Congress says it should do, but traditionally the Library has not gone into grant-making.

All right, Joe, have you a question.

MR. BECKER: Yes. Walter, I think it may be useful if we explained our reasoning behind suggesting a new federal investment policy in libraries; and essentially it may appear as if we are abandoning our approach to the categorical aid, although I don't think we have gone that far. But basically there is a general trend in the administration of decentralized funding in the states and giving them more responsibility for doing things locally.

Secondly, categorical aid seems to have promoted a haphazard system in the country, as good as it has been for certain purposes; while I think the Commission would like to see some continuation of categorical aid, implied in this draft document is that if that occurs, that it then should be done in such a way that it stimulates interdependent growth among the states for national benefits.

How do you evaluate the past categorical aid, and to what extent do you think it should be continued in the future?

MR. BRAHM: Well, I would agree that --

CHM. BURKHARDT: Do you all hear?

All right, fine, go ahead, Mr. Brahm.

MR. BRAHM: I would agree that many of the programs that have developed across the country from categorical grants have not been the successes that perhaps have been hoped for, but it still seems to me that there were sufficient of those programs that were successes that did accomplish things that certainly the categorical grant program ought not to be phased out.

As Ms. Moore referred to earlier, that she was glad to come to some place where roads were not all important, but it just seems to me that unless you have some categorical aid grants, that libraries do not have the heft to compete with the highway departments and welfare departments and so on in the state government, and then on down locally.

So unless you have money earmarked for some of these programs, I am afraid the libraries are going to lose out.

If you are suggesting that -- I gather the tenor of your remarks was that you are -- you were not cutting out funding of libraries but that you were cutting out the categorical aid programs, it seems to me that whatever money purposes you would tend to use it for, the administration of that is important, the continuity of that administration, and I still think in terms that it would be valid, in terms of the administration that handles that money or the agency that handles that money.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Bessie, do you have any questions?

MS. MOORE: Yes. I would like to ask Mr. Brahm, since he has had rich experience as a State Librarian in two states --

MR. BRAHM: It wasn't so rich.

MS. MOORE: Well,maybe monetarily not but experience-wise I am sure it was.

I would like to ask you to comment on the role of the state library as you would recommend it for coordinating and planning purposes for libraries within a state and within a network.

MR. BRAHM: Well, I would say that the state library is the key agency, that it has always been projected to be in terms of distributing and planning for library service in the state. I think it is on a tightrope in terms of satisfying the library interest in each state. That is, you never can be sure of whether you are providing too much leadership or too little leadership, and you always find that there are dissident groups, and the state library is the old apple tree that has a lot of sticks and stones thrown at it; but if you are going to get rid of that apple tree, it seems to me you create a worse situation if you are going to go from nationally down to completely local, I guess, which is the point of your question --

CHM. BURKHARDT: Are you keeping a record of just what the effect of revenue-sharing is in your state?

MR. BRAHM: Well, in Connecticut we are keeping a record as far as we can gather the records, but I would say that from the local level it has been good in a few spotty cases and not so good in the majority areas of the state, even though there are a lot of local libraries that have received revenue-sharing. It has no continuity to it. I mean they get money for a one-shot affair, build up their book collection for this year only, or the money is held for some capital improvement and an additional library building, which again is not a recurring expenditure, so that I am afraid that revenue-sharing will have no continuity or permanence for succeeding years.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Have there been any programs that have had to be terminated because of the stop in the funds?

MR. BRAHM: Oh, yes, we have cut out in Connecticut all of our grant money to local libraries and we have been able to continue only the services that were going to local libraries, operated from a state library -- teletype, interloan and that type of thing -- which the state government funded to replace loss of federal funds.

But the categorical grant loan that we were distributing to local libraries for special projects and the operation of the system offices and programs was entirely cut out last year because of the uncertainty of how much we were going to get, and entirely for this coming year, unless Congress' appropriation prevails.

MR. STEVENS: This afternoon I know you will be going to the dedication of the Conservation Center in New England, and we heard the distinguished director of the Harvard University Libraries talking about the importance of preservation of Harvard University and elsewhere.

I wonder if you could say something about the preservation of book materials and other materials from the point of view of a state library and public libraries generally, as differentiated from the academic libraries generally, and what this new center will mean to the preservation of materials in New England.

MR. BRAHM: Let's see if I can answer the middle part of your several questions first, and that is the difference that we view in terms of the preservation for academic libraries, public libraries and other institutions.

institutions.

In setting up the Conservation Center -- and I can speak for it because it was set up by the Compact agreement of the six New England states through their state librarians and state library agency directors, who are its administrators -- we do not envision that the Center would make any difference between the libraries, the institutions and the public units of government, including town governments in New England, who had the materials for preservation.

So our Center is intended to treat the problems of all public institutions wherever their materials need preservation, and we felt there was a great need for this Center because I think it is only in the past ten years that really preservation has come into the consciousness of our librarians and our trustees and our public officials that had to do with public documents, just suddenly realizing that our fuel crisis has burst upon us in the past two years. And all of a sudden the materials that we were preserving or storing since the origin of this country, our pollution and the way we were treating them, our lack of responsibility we were giving to preservation has suddenly just caught up to us and we are all now realizing this; that our efforts have to be more than normal to try and take care of it.

So this is why we have set up this Conservation Center.

I don't know whether I have answered all of your questions or not.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Brahm.

I think we will proceed to the next witness, Mr. Arthur J. Kissner, of the Fitchburg Public Library. Before Mr. Kissner starts his testimony, I would like to point out that we left the time from roughly 11:45 -- we are running a little behind -- for public testimony and we are prepared to stay right through the lunch hour if there are a sufficient number of witnesses.

I don't know how many of you have signed up, but if you intend to utilize this opportunity, please do register with whoever is keeping the book outside the door.

Now, Mr. Kissner, who is Chief Librarian of Fitchburg Public Library in Fitchburg, Massachusetts.

Would you like to comment further on your statement?

MR. KISSNER: Yes, I would like to make a few initial remarks. I am not going to go over my written testimony.

I would just like to point out, as you know, that what I attempted to do there was to give you my experience as the Chief Librarian of the Fitchburg Public Library, which serves a city of 43,000, and since 1962 has served as a regional resource center as part of the regional system program in Massachusetts.

T6 I have indicated what has happened to us as a result of that program and the benefits that the users have found. My second concern had to do with a coordinated program at the local level, and I would like to perhaps react very briefly to your draft statement which I received on Monday, and specifically limit my remarks to the second concern that I have.

It seems to me one of our most important points is the development of a coordinated program of the nation's libraries, information centers and other knowledge resources to make sure that they evolve as part of an integrated national plan. It seems to me that among the results of this development should be a coordinated library program at the local level. I am not quite sure that this is a great concern of yours, as I read your statement. It seems to me that this is essential if we are to achieve the goal which you state in your draft, "Each citizen be able to gain access to the pertinent part of the total information resources which interest him," and I am looking at the user at the very local level. And I would like to suggest a few points that seem important to me.

Number one, this integrated program must be built from the ground up as well as from the top down. I think you make that point in your statement: "That the national plan must encourage better articulation of services at the local level," and somehow encourage us at the local level to develop a clearer definition of the roles of the different agencies at the local level, generally speaking, and with respect to specific services.

Also, it seems to me, that the national plan must encourage us to carry out a needs analysis at the local level with respect to our local publics to insure that the system will provide meaningful and useful information to the people we serve.

As I see it from my somewhat limited point of view in Massachusetts, we seem to have three systems developing: The public library system, the school library system, and we have academic and research library programs. There seems to be no coordination to any extent between these programs at a place like Fitchburg. The user makes contact with either one of the three, but he cannot be assured of getting service from the totality if he makes contact with one of the three.

I would like to illustrate one rather small point that is of current concern to us, and maybe I blow it up out of proportion because it is of immediate concern, and that has to do with film service, and I would like to make a few statements about that and express my concern in that way.

First of all, 16 millimeter film service is a somewhat special but expensive yet increasingly important library service. During the past decade we have experienced the reappearance of older film classics and the use of these films for significant purposes in the community and in the schools. During the past calendar year our library reported a greater number of individual viewing films borrowed from the library than the total number of books borrowed, and I don't think this is unusual where a library provides good film service because of the great demand for films and the limited funds available to support this service. The three regional systems in Massachusetts that provide this service find it necessary to impose restrictions on the use of films in schools. This is not unusual, and I believe that the American Library Association policy in this area recommends a rather separate public library film service to the community with no attempt to meet the needs of the schools.

The argument for this, I think, is justified and points out that if we permit the schools to nominate the use of the service plant for the community, we infringe upon the opportunity of the community to obtain this service. The schools must develop their own resources in the area of 16 millimeter films.

It seems to me that there is an alternative here that might be considered and relates to my concern, that we somehow find new ways of coordinating our efforts at the local level.

I would like to at least suggest that we try to find a way in which the schools can be encouraged to contribute to the support of the regional public library film service, especially for special types of films that can be most effectively shared by these two agencies, such as feature film classics, film on contemporary issues and so on. I am not suggesting that we attempt to take over the responsibility of the schools for providing curriculum, specific curriculum-related materials in this area, and I don't want to blow this up out of proportion. I just illustrate it as a very specific service that I think is a problem and perhaps is an example of the problem that I see in terms of providing coordinated service at the local level.

Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any questions, gentlemen?

Mrs. Wu?

MS. WU: I am quite interested in your suggestion to coordinate the film service between the school district and the public library system. I think it has something to do with task structure, because when the task goes to the school district, the school district is supposed to provide materials for the use of the schools, for the teachers; and when the task goes to the public library system, the public library has another fund for its own collection.

How would you advise the Commission to go about this? In other words, can we coordinate the film service or collections between the two systems?

MR. KISSNER: Well, one way would be to consider providing some kind of incentive fund whereby the schools might be reimbursed to some extent for the contribution to what is now a public library program. For example, one suggestion of the director of audio-visual services had the city of Fitchburg was that his teachers be allowed to continue to use the film service but that every time the use was made, that an assessment would be made to the public school system of the city of Fitchburg and that a credit could perhaps be accumulated over a period of time, and on the basis of use the school system would in turn purchase films to add to the collection to provide duplicate copies of films that are creating problems for us now. It could be that a federal program or even a state program might watch whatever the schools contribute.

Right now we are getting funds from the state through the regional program for the film service. We had been obtaining additional support from the federal government which, to some extent, created this problem because we did get significant support for about four or five years. The film service was increased to the point where it became valuable to the schools, and now we have a very valuable resource, but I am not quite sure that it is being made use of or being used as effectively as it could be, and that perhaps with some kind of shared funding from the schools for this service in certain areas -- I am not suggesting that it take the place of the basic film service that the schools require, but certain areas, such as the provision of 16-millimeter feature films and certain other kinds of films -- it might be advisable to share that.

Once again, I really don't want to get into this in any detail unless you feel very strongly about it, because I am not a film specialist, because there are other people in the state who know much more about it than

I do; but I want to state that it is a problem and something we can overcome by some kind of coordinated effort at the local level.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: You say, Mr. Kissner, in one part of your testimony that the public does not restrict its use of public libraries because of municipal or even state boundaries. We had testimony once in Atlanta by a librarian from Mobile, Alabama, who said that they draw from Florida and Mississippi and they encouraged it. On the other hand, we have had testimony from a librarian from Detroit saying, "Well, we don't want 'those people' coming in to use our library." It was a suburban library.

Can you give us your experiences regarding the reciprocal borrowing obviously on an interstate service, and also if you can expand that into the areas of large metropolitan areas in relationship between suburban and inner city reciprocal borrowing?

MR. KISSNER: Well, I don't think I am prepared to speak for large urban and suburban metropolitan areas, having had very little experience in that.

In our own situation, where we are a small factory community of 43,000, but a business area for 180,000 people in North Central Massachusetts, which includes about five or six towns in Southern New Hampshire, we have encouraged this primarily because the state encourages us to do so by providing us with reimbursement for extending our services to people outside the city of Fitchburg. Even before the state program in 1962, many of your libraries were permitting individuals working in the community but who lived outside to use the library; but since 1962 we have permitted anyone within the state to use the library; and beginning now, this fall, we are permitting people in the southern New Hampshire area to use the library as well, justifying it on the basis that it is to the advantage of the city of Fitchburg to entice people from southern New Hampshire to come down to the city to shop.

I was surprised myself, as I indicated in my testimony, that whereas about ten years ago we know that about 20 percent of our registered cardholders were not residents of the city of Fitchburg, last year, when we counted this, we found that more than fifty percent of people requesting new cards lived outside of the city of Fitchburg.

MS. WU: Do they have to pay a fee?

MR. KISSNER: There is no fee, no.

MS. WU: That is the reciprocal agreement?

MR. KISSNER: Yes. Within our program, as you probably know it, at least within central Massachusetts, I should say, we have a reciprocal borrowing plan that is honored by, I believe, all of the 70 libraries in our region.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We have time for another question. John?

MR. LORENZ: Will the Worcester regional and the Fitchburg subregional continue to prosper with state, regional and local funds, even though federal funds may be discontinued?

MR. KISSNER: I don't think so for certain kinds of services, and one of them that I mentioned is the film services. We just don't get enough opportunities for that, even though we get support from the state, and it will continue to exist, but I am not sure that it will continue to prosper unless we get this additional support for certain kinds of special services, such as the film service. I know we did get some support in terms of intercommunication between the regions.

There are many ways in which federal funds could help us, but right now, for example, getting back to film service, although we have extensive inter-library loans on printers, there is no problem there within the three regions; we do not share the film collections because--partly because of the terrific demand on these films and the fact that each region cannot extend its collection beyond the region itself. I think this is one way in which the federal funds can be used to provide greater coordination of and sharing in all of our services within the state.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We have time for one more question. Mrs. Moore.

MS. MOORE: Mr. Kissner, I wanted to ask you a question about your testimony, about the in-service training which we are able to give under your regional program to libraries affiliated with you. Will you be able to continue that without the federal funds?

MR. KISSNER: I really cannot speak to that point. I just mentioned that as one benefit to the member libraries, that Barbara Weaver, who is the regional administrator, and Mr. Joseph Hopkins, who is the head librarian in the Worcester Public library and the contracting agent for the assisting program, are directly responsible for this kind of service to the member libraries. My role is that of director of a resource center in the northern part of the region; we do not assume any responsibilities for this kind of activity, so I really cannot answer that question.

MS. MOORE: I take it that these are non-professional librarians who serve in some smaller libraries?

MR. KISSNER: Some of them are, although some of them are graduates from library schools.

But a good share of it is through them because these are very small communities for the most part and do not have full professional education.

MS. MOORE: I relate to this because the other sophisticated members of this Commission do not feel, I am afraid, sympathy with these kinds of problems at the local level where you have this sort of situation; and while I am talking, I am sure the Chairman would concur, and all of the members of this Commission would, that you take our warm greetings to Miss Wallace, who was a member of our Commission who preceded this one.

Of course, she has long been recognized for her fine work for libraries and I am sure we would like to be remembered to her, if you would be so kind.

MR. KISSNER: I know she would greatly appreciate that because she has followed this Commission and she appreciates receiving the information that she has received about your work, and I know because I had discussed this with her only recently.

Thank you very much,Mrs. Moore.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Kissner.

Mr. Raymond De Buse, Worcester Area Cooperative Libraries, Worcester, Massachusetts.

MR. DEBUSE: Yes, sir.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Have I got your name right?

MR. DEBUSE: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. DeBuse is coordinator of library systems in the Worcester area.

MR. DEBUSE: Thank you very much.

I would just like to comment today briefly on your draft proposal of a national program or a national library service.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Before you do, I might say for the benefit of the rest of the audience that we sent out to all of the witnesses who were listed a draft proposal of a new federal program which is very tentative and is the first step in what we think the Commission really ought to be concerned with, and that is the drafting of a national program, and the witnesses have had copies of that. I believe there are some copies available for those of you who would like to pick one up, and our purpose in disseminating this is to get as much response to it at this stage so that we can refine and build it into something that is really substantial and accurate and reflects the needs and the suggestions of both the experts and the general user of libraries and information.

So now, Mr. DeBuse, will you make your comment, please.

MR. DEBUSE: As someone who has worked actively in the area of interlibrary cooperation, I certainly endorse the approach that is represented here, but I want to try to get in a word of caution.

In your proposal, and indeed in my written testimony that I have given to you as well, I see something of a tendency toward seeing the network or networking as a panacea for librarian information problems and I think this is a mistake. Distance and access are not the only problems that have to be solved. Indeed, I think there are some other problems that come before these.

Let me go back to the interstate highways again. In your proposal you make the analogy between an interstate highway system and a national information network, and this is, I think, a very valid analogy; but keep in mind that with the interstate highway system there have been vast social and physical and environmental readjustments from this elaborate development of something, you know, a network by specialists. I would suggest that maybe what we ought to be considering before we propose a national network is some sort of social-informational-environmental impact study. Specifically, I think we ought to look at the two, the first two assumptions in your list of priorities and objectives in planning librarian information services for the nation.

Number one is users -- to identify the various types of users, et cetera; to determine the information needs of these.

The second one is to determine the adequacy and efficiencies of current library and information services, and I don't think that in your proposal you do this.

A national bibliographic network certainly modeled after the NCLC network, or whatever is going to be useful to a very small proportion of the population. I think we have to look more carefully at the vehicle of information, not the roadway or the pathway -- the network -- but the means by which information is contained, what information is contained -- the book, the film, the video tape, whatever -- and determine how these are being used, how effectively these are being used and what other alternatives there are.

How do people obtain the dollars they need for everyday living, for business, for research, for scholarly work? I don't think that these have been satisfactorily answered. The social implications are going to be immense of any network, and I think that we should take a good long look at these basic questions before we start postulating for the network. There are thousands who are working in the area of interlibrary cooperation who are headed pell-mell toward one network or another, and we are charged with doing that. I would suggest that it is up to the Commission and other national agencies to try to determine what this environmental impact might be.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any questions?

MR. LORENZ: Can you tell us specifically whether your Cooperative is made up of all types of libraries, and then specifically how are you using NELINET?

MR. DEBUSE: Okay. The Cooperative is made up or consists of 15 libraries: academic, both university, college and junior college; public library and special research library.

The medical library and the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Technology, the Art Museum Library and the Antiquarian Society would be special libraries.

We have not involved ourselves formally with school libraries at this point, although at some point in the future I certainly anticipate being able to articulate with those as well.

MR. LORENZ: Those member libraries are giving you financial support, cash support?

MR. DEBUSE: Yes, yes, and I might point out that we have had funding from federal sources through the state, LSCA. We have had funding from local private sources. This year for the first time these 15 libraries are paying the entire cost of the development office which I had; it is a very small office, but it is a significant step. I don't think there is any possibility that three or four years ago they would have considered spending this amount of money to set up this office for something which they had no knowledge of what good might come of it.

MR. LORENZ: Could you give us a rough estimate of what degree of library use your cooperative represents in your region?

MR. DEBUSE: I am not exactly certain how you mean that.

MR. LORENZ: Well, of all of the libraries serviced in the area, how much would be represented by the libraries that support this program?

MR. DEBUSE: I see. Quite likely the school libraries are the only significant group that is not represented. I am not quite certain what proportion that might represent, but virtually, I would say, outside of the school libraries, 95 percent of the libraries serviced is involved with our Cooperative,

MR. LORENZ: Then going on to the second part of my question now, are you using NELINET?

MR. DEBUSE: At this point -- well, let me point out that the Worcester Cooperative Libraries is itself a member of NELINET and as such we are installing terminals on the shared cataloging system now in operation with NCLC through NELINET in a number of libraries we are already operating and anticipate expanding in two more, and I hope to be able to continue because, well, when I was brought into this Cooperative, the state educational objective was to develop computer-based cooperative processing capability, and it seems to me foolish to do this when it was being done elsewhere, so we are hoping to develop these capabilities through the larger network, I think, which is a very cost-beneficial way of going about it certainly, which is something else.

I might comment on your draft proposal now. You state that you want to maintain the same degree of autonomy for local libraries that has been traditionally the case. I don't see any sort of network cooperative integrated with the individual library that is going to maintain individual autonomy. Cooperation necessitates giving up some degree of autonomy.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner, then Mr. Aines.

MR. LERNER: Mr. DeBuse, you referred to the information delivery capability of CATV in your paper. Let me ask a couple of questions on that level.

Number one, within your system cable now, do you see cable as a delivery system through CRT data bank into the home, or do we limit it to story hours on video tape? In what areas do you think it really has meaning?

MR. DEBUSE: Okay. At the moment no one in our group is using CATV. There is a cable television in the area, but it is relatively undeveloped. We have proposals for, we are exploring this, but so is everyone else at this stage of the game.

From the use of the system, I think, a great deal has been made of information having a CATV reference, which I think at this point is probably not very successful and will not be successful for some time. I do feel that once you do combine the CATV system with the computer system as you suggested, which company is a long while off, it is a two-way system which would be required, these are expensive. They are being installed very rarely now. I think that this is the ultimate hope, yes, that the computer-based system will be the thing, but I am not going to rule out the story hours or video reference or any other kind of informational service that the library might be able to provide through that channel, through that cable. I think it is wide open.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: Your document that you provided us is an extraordinary statement of honest views.

MR. DEBUSE: Thank you.

MR. AINES: For example, in your last statement you point out that information is an increasingly valuable commodity in our culture and that if libraries cannot effectively provide, they may be well bypassed as vital parts of the vast information exchange which society is becoming and recede through a status more in keeping with the common stereotype of the library.

Let me read one more item and then I will ask you to comment on these as you wish: "If libraries were to be subjected to an impartial but comprehensive investigation of the use of public monies, the resulting scandal would blacken the positive image in America for years to come."

Now, these are pretty strong statements and I know you felt strongly enough to put them in. You might want to elaborate a bit for us on that.

MR. DEBUSE: Well, I would find it very difficult to prove the second statement that you cite, but I do feel from my work in the interlibrary cooperation area, from what I have been able to see just within the Worcester area, that there is a tremendous amount of duplication that is needed, there is -- well, I might point to a tremendous amount of needed duplication that does not exist, so there is another side to this story as well.

I don't think that anyone who has really any idea of the extent of the library community obviously is getting away from the feeling that every library must be self-sufficient and certainly in, say, the public library field it has been relatively well developed, the concept of sharing, as within the central Massachusetts regional library system; even there I would wager that there is a vast amount of really unnecessary duplication.

I don't want to beat this too long because it is something that many people have pointed out, and maybe there is not as much on a national scale as we might imagine, as much needless duplication; but from my experience, you know, I would have to be proven otherwise before I will accept it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz, did you have a question?

MR. LORENZ: Yes. Are there other examples of your kind of cooperative in Massachusetts or New England that you know of?

MR. DEBUSE: Well, there are other cooperatives, yes. Some of them are in various stages of development, some of them carry out programs that I think that we would like to, but so far we are unable to. To my knowledge, though, there are very few cooperatives such as ours, where the member libraries have made a point to make the thrust of their effort through a central planning office rather than themselves getting together and trying to work out proper programs.

Anyone can develop a union list of serials, for example, and everyone does, or we have done it. We are right now, however, trying to develop a list of print materials and develop institutional guidelines of lending of these materials. That is more difficult, and I would suggest that this kind of project would be merely impossible without some kind of central office or central person to deal with it.

MR. LORENZ: Is there a basic descriptions of what you are doing in print somewhere?

MR. DEBUSE: I have had occasional newsletters which collectively describe what we are doing, but as a survey, no.

MR. LORENZ: I would like to see what you have in print, and I think other members of the Commission might also; it seems to me that what we are hearing from you comes closer to an element of the network plan that the Commission is conceding than almost anything else that I have heard in terms of a regional application.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Bessie, would you have the last question, please?

MS. MOORE: In your central office, is it funded from each of the 15 libraries and do they have a share equally, or how is your office funded?

MR. DEBUSE: It is funded by the 15 libraries, but on an equal basis with assessed fees for both the operating program and for the development effort, on the basis of book budget, which is not entirely fair but is the best means that we could arrive at.

MS. MOORE: I am sure you have also had the unequal contributions from federal revenue-sharing that has caused the problem.

MR. DEBUSE: I am not quite certain what you mean by that. To my knowledge, and I may be wrong in this, there is no revenue-sharing funds being used for libraries within our immediate area.

MS. MOORE: Do you mean none of the libraries in your immediate area are getting federal funds?

MR. DEBUSE: Well, keep in mind that the public library, the Worcester Public Library, is the only public library that is involved directly in WCL.

MS. MOORE: I didn't understand that.

MR. DEBUSE: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr.Becker, you had a question?

MR. BECKER: Mr. DeBuse, I am inclined to say that I like to think that your idea of a social-environmental impact study is a very useful one. Did you do anything like it prior to the establishment of your Cooperative system? What actually prompted its establishment? Was it social need or was it economy?

MR. DEBUSE: It certainly was not social need. It was economy, and no, nothing of that sort was done, and I have proposed that we embark upon that kind of study within our area. I get nods, "Yes, we should do that," but it is way down the list of priorities somewhere. And it is not going to be funded unless I can somehow spend the time to really push it. Yet if I do that, I am not accomplishing the things that I am expected to accomplish.

So you know, I am really in a bind in that regard.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. DeBuse, I do want to urge you to send us your comments on that national plan, especially on those aspects of our draft which you think have been neglected at the expense of the emphasis on networking. We would be very interested in hearing from you on that; and that, I should say, goes for any other witnesses. We do welcome your comments on it and hope that you will write to us about it.

Thank you.

MR. DEBUSE: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I think it would be a good idea now to have a little break for the benefit of our reporter here and some of the rest of us. So I would like to declare a recess of about ten or fifteen minutes, and then we will return and hear Mr. Lushington.

T-7 [Brief recess.]

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ladies and gentlemen, if you will resume your seats, I believe we will be ready to resume with the next witness.

Will the members of the Committee come up and take their places. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Lushington.

MR. LUSHINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Burkhardt.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I would like to introduce Mr.

Lushington to the rest of you. He is the Director of the Greenwich Library in Greenwich, Connecticut. I am very happy to have you with us.

MR. LUSHINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Burkhardt.

Members of the Commission, I had a chance to glance at a report and the suggestions about the national library network, and I am certainly not an expert in this field, knowing very little about the computers and this kind of thing. It certainly is a breath-taking concept and idea and certainly very much overdue, I think, as far as the United States is concerned.

I would like to reinforce Mr. DeBuse's comments and add a particular sidelight of my own that relates to the written testimony that I sent to you earlier, and that is, that I do feel that as I interpret Mr. DeBuse's testimony, we should be very interested in user needs and emphasize research into user needs perhaps before we emphasize the overall network concept.

In connection with that, it seems to me that many of the details of the proposal as I read them, and I suppose this is partly because I am not primarily a technical librarian, that they seem to emphasize the technology and not the user needs, and I feel that this is especially important because any document that this

Commission produces is bound to be to a great extent a political and public relations document as well as a technical document that relates to library use; so that I would hope that any document released to the public would try to de-emphasize the technology, the use of technological terminology, and emphasize user needs, especially research into user needs, and especially that research before a final network description be produced.

I was interested also in the question of regional library service. You heard Mr. DeBuse's testimony and testimony of earlier people this morning relating to regional library networks in New England, and I think that one of the problems is that from your point of view you are looking at probably New England as a region and from the point of view of many of the practicing, working librarians in New England, we are looking at smaller intrastate cooperatives as regions.

Mr. DeBuse's region, for example, and the region that I am a trustee of, the Southwestern Connecticut Librarian System, which is doing some of the things that the Massachusetts regionals are trying to do but with less state support and less state funding, and we are looking at these as our regions and as our backup support for the individual libraries.

The other concept that I am sure that you have dealt with and are alert to, but I thought perhaps I could mention it, is the difficulty of national library legislation that uses the state as a unit of service. This is very difficult, as I am sure you are well aware; the states vary tremendously not only in population, but even states in similar population, size, vary considerably in the distribution of population in the way in which library networks can be organized within the state.

For example, my own state, Connecticut, although it has quite a large population of several million, the largest city in Connecticut is 150,000, and we are divided into a strict town framework. We have no county governments. So that the largest single tax-supported unit of services is a town of 150,000 and it is questionable whether that tax base can support regional library service; so that we will need different kinds of standards and we will be a different kind of political unit than other states similar in size to ours.

I thought that perhaps I could also mention for a moment that I was fortunate enough to have a fellowship to study English medium-sized libraries last year, and in the course of that study I had an opportunity to see their system of national library bibliographic control and what they do.

If I understand it correctly, it is to divide the range of subject specialties into surprisingly small libraries, that is, of a relatively small town library serving 50,000 people in England, which will have a national library bibliographic specialty in which they will be expected to apply their own town budget to purchase all the materials in that perhaps somewhat narrow subject specialty.

What this means is that all of these libraries have extensive closed stacks, usually compact closed stacks, and in these requests come quite frequently. Whenever inter-library loans come to these individual libraries, they have to take the staff's time to go down, find the books in the closed stacks, package them and mail them out. They use regular mail delivery, and no delivery system in England works probably because of the low staff salaries.

This is not as great a problem as it would be in the United States, but it does seem to me a rather cumbersome system and it rather overbalances the book collection in these individual libraries to a rather poor extent in terms of local service needs; and it would seem to be more economical to create regional reference centers whose sole function would be to serve these in-depth needs rather than to require the individual libraries to serve the in-depth needs.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

You spoke of what you thought was a typical question, of using the state as the unit of service. Now, obviously the states do vary and that does provide a great difficulty to act as though they were uniform. What other unit is practical?

MR. LUSHINGTON: Well, I think that obviously we have to deal with the political reality, which is one of the points I was making earlier, and the states have to be -- we have to gain their cooperation and gain their support for any national library network that we set up. I am merely suggesting that the standards be organized in terms of user needs rather than political entities and so that you permit a great deal of flexibility.

Now, obviously I don't have any solutions. I am just here with the questions in that particular case.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We have a question from Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Mr. Lushington, a few months ago, and I think this is just for information, we did have our only conference on user needs in Denver, where we invited 30 people to spend almost a week discussing user needs and these were not just librarians. I think the preponderance of invitees was from lay groups and it covered everything from the minority groups, the culturally deprived and the institutionalized, et cetera; and we are soon to issue -- maybe Chuck can tell us when -- the document which records these proceedings.

We did this with a little trepidation because, as you know, user needs can be expressed as a function of geography, age, specialization, level of education; it is a kind of multidimensional problem and awfully difficult to get a handle on it. We would like, I think, to see more research done in this area but are not sure how to go about it. Do you have any suggestions?

MR. LUSHINGTON: Well, one concrete suggestion that I am currently working on is a combination of the librarian and a marketing person from an advertising agency. I think the advertising people, marketing people, have created quite useful methods of statistical research into determining from in-depth research what the user really needs, what he will respond to; and I am not familiar with -- and again I am not primarily a research or an academically inclined librarian, so this may be available, and maybe not, but this is something that I am not that familiar with.

However, I am not familiar with any research that is focusing on the needs of the non-librarian user, finding out who the non-librarian user is and finding out what the relation to librarian user service is. It seems to me this would be a good approach: an in-depth survey designed by a librarian and an advertising or marketing person in a very limited community area, which would give us some kind of information that I think we do not now have.

I also think that perhaps it would be useful to gain different kinds of statistical insights into library use. I am sure you are all familiar with the Rutgers project on the measurement of library effectiveness. I think there is one, at least, private study trying to differentiate between libraries by using different kinds of statistical methods than are currently in practice.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Lushington, in your prepared statement you suggested that there was a need for a more structured library association, and I am wondering if you would tell us how that structure ought to be worked out and what the ties ought to be, rather than the more informal structure that now exists and what agencies that you feel we ought to be in touch with that you feel that we are not in touch with now.

MR. LUSHINGTON: Let me perhaps cite an example. In looking over your national network proposal, I came across several times, I think, in there where you mentioned and used the term "standards," and in flipping through here, on page 12 you say, "Supporting responsibility within the state so that they meet standards which qualify them to meet the standards and services available through the national program."

Now, if the standards qualify them to meet the standards through the national program, necessarily there must be input as to what those standards contain, and I am sure you are all aware that the ALA is currently the body that seems to set national library standards. I am not sure exactly why; I guess perhaps by action, custom or tradition. But it seems to me there is some kind of relationship between this body and the standard-setting body, whatever it may be within sometime in the future; and if these standards are going to be utilized to qualify libraries to be members of the national network, you want to have some more definite information than that. Does that suffice?

MR. STEVENS: Well, it indicates to me that you don't have any specific channels that you think we ought to use more than we are already using them and that we are in contact with the standards group at ALA and we will be speaking with Mr. Wedgeworth on Friday, and we are continuing those contacts to make sure that what we do is in line with what they have in mind, and that the standards that they are proposing are realistic from the point of view of the Commission.

The same thing goes with all kinds of specifications that they are working on, the statistics handbook and so on. We are trying to make the input there. I was hoping that you had some new ideas that we are not following.

MR. LUSHINGTON: No. That is probably due to my lack of familiarity with what the Commission is already doing. However, perhaps I could comment, that perhaps the input should be more in terms of policy rather than in terms of specific standards. Perhaps it would be the Commission's function to settle policy for standards.

We all, I think, suffer from the concept that American library standards for the last 20 years have been goals and not achievable standards in the sense that there is no doubt that 50 percent of the libraries in the United States do not meet existing public library standards, and perhaps it could be the Commission that could determine that standards should no longer be goals but should be feasible, financially achievable standards; and that as a policy might be communicated to the American Library Association or some of these other bodies that you are already in communication with.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: You have turned from technology and seem to be more concerned with user needs. Would you respond to a question I have? Is it possible that we have non-users of our libraries because our educational systems in our states are deficient in the elementary schools and the high schools, the educators are not teaching people the value of reading and how to read, they are not teaching them the value of good literature; so, therefore, beyond the mandated book review in the English class, once the user goes out he is not a user after high school because he is not taught in the school the appreciation of books and good literature?

MR. LUSHINGTON: Well, I try to avoid giving opinions of other educational institutions, but I could comment that I am familiar with what is happening in libraries, not only in my own libraries but in other libraries in the state of Connecticut and elsewhere, but it seems to me that there is very little capability both within the libraries and within the publishing industry to make available materials in formats that would be more acceptable to non-library users than the traditional book format.

So that I, you know, think that is an area where there really is a need and where there can be a lot done. But as to the current thrust of other modern educational institutions, I certainly would not want to comment on that.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: I would like to make some comment on a couple of points.

Now, in talking about use and need, since to me this is a local problem, the library itself should set up a book selection policy and you can even have a committee, a book selection committee, which will contain or consist of people from the committee to decide what true needs and use that your community has.

Another thing is about regionalization. In your introduction you said something about New England and the cooperatives. I think in this part of the country your regionalization is a little bit different from what I know of in California. In California there is the Los Angeles County Library System, which is a regionalized library, although it is under the county library and it is under the county government, but it does have different regions.

Now, your regionalization means different units joined together and becoming regionalized?

MR. LUSHINGTON: I am not too familiar with the California practice, but I am not sure there is as great a difference as you seem to feel. However, as I understand, the California county library systems make use of existing libraries.

Now, this would also be true in New England. The New England regional systems make use of existing libraries and they have superimposed on that a relatively small staff of people whose job it is to help to develop those libraries and help to give cooperative services that the individual library is not capable of.

I am not sure how much more than that California system does.

MS. WU: Well, the California libraries are under the county government, but it is under one system. But it has been divided up into different regions, and under the regions there are branches. Does that apply to the New England systems?

MR. LUSHINGTON: But these individual libraries and branches still have local funding and local boards of trustees.

MS. WU: Right. The county government pays for it.

MR. LUSHINGTON: The county government or local town governments?

MS.WU: Oh, I see. The little towns will contribute their taxes to Los Angeles County and Los Angeles County will allocate their funds.

MR. LUSHINGTON: I see. Well, in New England the money comes mostly from tax support from the local townships and not from county governments. However, it is also a mistake to think that all of the New England states are the same, because in Massachusetts you have considerably more state funds going into regional systems, as far as I understand, than you do in Connecticut, where there is no state funding for regional systems in Connecticut. The regional systems depend solely on local contributions for their funding, so it is a welter of different situations.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any other questions?

MR. LORENZ: Have you done a user study in southwest Connecticut, Mr. Lushington?

MR. LUSHINGTON: No, we have not. We are seeking funding for a non-library user, as I described, but we haven't yet found funding for that and the survey has not been done.

One community in Connecticut has done a non-library user -- very rough kind of non-library user survey to find out what media non-library users could be reached through, whether it is newspapers or television and so on, and this has been done in one town in Connecticut; as far as I know, that is all that has been done, and that is just an immediate survey, not a need survey.

MR. LERNER: What did they find out?

MR. LORENZ: What was the finding?

MR. LUSHINGTON: Very inconclusive: that non-library users all read newspapers and watched television and listened to the radio, so there was not much point in that.

CHM. BURKHARDT: If there are no further questions --

MR. LUSHINGTON: I think one interesting point that the survey did uncover, too, as far as that library was concerned, was that the best way to reach the non-library user is to make a non-library user telephone survey, because as a result they had an awful lot more people using the library as a result of the survey.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mr. Lushington.

We hear next from Ms. Elizabeth Myer, Director of Department of State Library Services, Providence, Rhode Island. Ms. Myer.

MS. MYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting me to submit testimony and to appear here today to speak.

When legislation was passed setting up the National commission in July, 1970, I rejoiced. I was proud that Senator Pell was one of the co-sponsors and conducted hearings of this subcommittee on education. I liked very much the role of the Commission as indicated in the legislation and I wish its future real success in achieving our national development.

In Rhode Island, the state library agency is the Rhode Island Department of State Library Services, which is a department of state government. The director is appointed by the Governor, and since 1964, when the department was established, I have been appointed by Governors of both persuasions.

Before the LSCA or even LSA were enacted, Rhode Island had not had any modern library legislation since before World War I. In 1964, our law set up a department of state government. The impact of federal legislation and federal funding is just beyond belief.

It was the prospect of the LSCA in 1964, passed in February of 1964, that allowed our General Assembly to pass that law of 1964, the first year it was introduced, and we have seen a remarkable change in Rhode Island ever since, thanks to the federal input -- not just the money that came through federal funding but through the leadership, the guidance, and we welcomed the partnership of the federal government. And when I speak in Rhode Island of partnership, I do refer to federal, state,local and not county, because in Rhode Island counties constitute no problem.

I am here to supply omissions from my written testimony and hopefully to answer some of your questions.

CHAIRMAN BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner.

MR. LERNER: First of all, I think that the library community in Rhode Island deserves a great deal of credit for putting the arm on Senator Pell. If all other states could have library-interested people as much as Senator Pell is, we would all be in better shape.

MS. MYER: Thank you, Mr. Lerner. You do know that we are not too modest in Rhode Island about our members of Congress, and when LSA and the LSCA had hard going and when we nearly lost the federal program in 1961, Congressman Fogarty was on the scene.

MR. LERNER: I want to direct myself to you. You have a list of things that LSCA should do, and I want to direct myself to one of those things and ask for your comment.

You say that we should establish guidelines on intellectual freedoms, which is one of your points. Can you comment on what you think from my librarian standpoint you would be the Supreme Court decision on obscenity?

MS. MYER: Are we going to stay here all day, all night?

MR. LERNER: In 25 words or less.

MS. MYER: I would hope that the Commission would take a very firm stand and that we could refer to our local situations so that when sporadic flareups occurred, we could speak with authority fortified by our good thinking.

Local communities certainly have their own ideas on this subject, and I would hate to see some of the local interpretations. We know what we want for free access, and I would like to see that strength behind the efforts of librarians and trustees.

MR. LERNER: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: In terms of federal, state, local partnership for library development, do you feel that libraries have reached the point where the federal assistance could no longer be categorical but could be channeled into more general purposes, such as outlined in the paper?

MS. MYER: Mr. Lorenz, we love the categorical grants. We are not ready to cast them off and, of course, when I read words like "collapsing" and "withdrawal" I am not in that frame of mind at all. I think the legislation that was authorized through 1976 still obtains. In Rhode Island we are a total network, and I refer to all types of libraries. We are supporting -- and I am speaking of the network -- ourselves by a combination of federal and state funds. If the appropriations were impounded indefinitely, obviously there would be a serious effect on all aspects, elements of the total network, and I certainly recommend strongly that the good development that has been so conspicuous since 1964 be given encouragement and continued support for further progress.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: I am delighted to make your acquaintance through your paper and also through your very wise words. I think I am going to remember one statement you made for a long time in the paper: "There is no strength gained by linking weakness with weakness." I think that is very well said.

I would like to have you reflect on something else you have said, however. You talk about the present methods in handling knowledge obviously are too haphazard, too privileged, too slow and too unpublicized; and again I think you make strong impact, but would you be willing to reflect on what you have said and then give us advice on what might be done?

MS. MYER: I think in our service we should accelerate the location of material and I think we should unify our efforts so that it is not haphazard. I think we should use technology to the maximum. Did I omit one, Mr. Aines?

MR. AINES: You have reinforced what you have said, I am sure.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: One of your points is that we should enlighten citizens as to what libraries can offer them. Along that line, do you think the national commission should encourage strong,active state associations of library trustees, strong, active state associations of librarians in each state? Do you think we should encourage that type of organization in each state?

MS. MYER: And do not omit, Mr. Casey, friends of libraries.

MR. CASEY: All right.

MS. MYER: I think there has to be a terrific public relations program which hopefully those who fund us will not look upon as decoration but as a necessity. We need to get home to the average citizen and the total citizenry what libraries have to offer, whether they don't know because they are apathetic or shy or whatever, but we have got to sell our goods and be salesmen, and it can come from both librarians and trustees.

MR. CASEY: In other words, to implement your suggestion --

MS. MYER: Use every legitimate means, yes.

MR. CASEY: -- organization of trustees and librarians and friends will be a way to go about doing this, to attract that?

MS. MYER: I am a very strong believer in using non-librarians. Naturally we are going to proclaim, but I think when it comes from the man in the street -- and I do wish the libraries would go after the man in the street and the children and all potential users.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I imagine you would be a strong supporter of Senator Pell's resolution that there be a White House conference on libraries in 1976?

MS. MYER: I certainly am, and I hope it moves along in the halls of Congress. I think that that could be a very significant thing, and we would hope by then to have even more proof of library progress.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: Could you comment on the present degree of cooperation among the state library agencies in New England in terms of region-wide planning and cooperation?

MS. MYER: I think the interstate library compact is a good example where the six-state library agencies did sign a document which permitted, for example, the New England Document Conservation Center that has an enormous role to play in the future. There are other ways that I think that our six states are beginning to cooperate. We certainly have our New England Library Association, the New England Library Board, NELINET, going back to the Document of Conservation, and that was a long time coming. It is an example of where all types of libraries will benefit, and certainly on Saturday when our department in Rhode Island put on a very significant workshop with Captain George N. Cunnier(phonetic), the director of the Center as chief speaker, we had all kinds of people there, not just librarians, but town clerks, people entrusted with records, because it was a day's workshop taking up not only the actual techniques but management and so forth and emphasizing that preventive measures are fully as important as the restoration aspect.

In Rhode Island we think of all types of libraries. In 1967 a state law was passed right on the heels of the 1966 amendments of the LSCA, which opened the door to interlibrary cooperation, state institutional services, library services to the blind and physically handicapped; and in 1967 our state law set up five interrelated library systems with a library designated in each of the systems to correlate and give leadership.

A state agency gives grants, a combination of federal and state money, and in each system there is this correlation of all types of libraries. There are teletype installations. Our department pays for the machine cost. In each of the systems, there is a vehicle, so there is better communication of all types.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you, Ms. Myer. We are running a little behind and I see we are going to have a lot of people from Rhode Island testifying during the public segment.

MS. MYER: That is making up for our size.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Could we then move to Mr. James Laubach, Jr., of Brattleboro, Vermont.

Mr. Laubach, I believe you are a library trustee. Is that correct?

MR. LAUBACH: I am an ex-trustee, yes, sir.

CHM. BURKHARD: An ex-trustee, but you are talking from the point of view of a trustee.

MR. LAUBACH: Yes, sir.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Please, if you have any remarks to expand on what you have sent us already, or if you want to go immediately into the questions, it is up to you.

MR. LAUBACH: I would make my only remark: That

I feel very much what Daniel must have felt way back when, because I believe the reason that I am here is because I suggested that I was simply mild about federal aid to community and state libraries.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Right. So now, Mr. Lerner, do you have a question?

MR. LERNER: Yes. Mr. Laubach, you say in the last part of your paper that it is up to the librarian and trustees to prove the library needs in competition with other community needs.

MR. LAUBACH: Yes, sir.

MR. LERNER: This is getting into the political arena and using the clout that libraries should have. You say where some have succeeded, others can, too. Well, tell us where some have succeeded and how.

T8 MR. LAUBACH: As far as a community public library goes, I would say primarily through their Board of Turstees, representative people in the community, usually holding responsible positions in the community, they are effective in two ways: One, through talking with their associates and other residents; and secondly, working through the town government in representing the library interests in the budget-making and the fund authorization process. To some extent, but in my own experience very much more limited, the same thing applies in state funding, but in this case it is at least my own observation that it is primarily the state library personnel who represent the budget needs rather than having considerable public support either from community libraries or from residents throughout the state.

MR. LERNER: Well, how do they do it? Do they threaten to picket the Mayor's house, do they close the library three days a week? What are the techniques that can be used to really get local personnel, local political personnel, to care about libraries?

MR. LAUBACH: Publicity, I believe, is the most effective one. I know of one community in which there are probably seven or eight thousand people, a small community, where a week doesn't go by but that there is a piece in the local paper concerning library activities such as new acquisitions, gifts, programs.

Publicity is perhaps the key word. Perhaps this is what you are searching for. Also a continuous year-round effort not just at budget time but something going on 365 days of the year.

CHM. BURKHARDT: How is revenue-sharing working out in Vermont? Is it producing the replacement of funds or --

MR. LAUBACH: I can't tell you of Vermont. I am a little more familiar with New Hampshire. In this case I know that a couple of communities have been successful in obtaining an allocation of revenue-sharing.

Of course, the overall view is that libraries don't stack up very well when it comes to trying to obtain a portion of these allocated funds, but again it comes back to the publicity, the awareness, making a real effort to go after them rather than throwing up your hands and saying, "Well, highways are first and then we have schools and,you know, there is a sewer problem in town, so let's not talk too loud about our libraries." There has been some success.

I would really question whether community libraries have individually been injured very much through the termination of federal funds. They have been hurt through reduction in state library services and in many cases state library services to communities, but I don't believe there has been any -- as far as I can see, in the upper New England states I haven't observed any noticeable effect on local services rendered by the community library.

MR. LORENZ: How does the books-by-mail service work? Obviously the larger libraries would lend more than they would borrow, I suppose. Are they reimbursed in any way for what they lend and for the cost of such lending?

MR. LAUBACH: The books-by-mail, as I have seen it, has been operated by the state library, not by community libraries. In Vermont, a publication tabloid and format have been distributed and the resident receiving it can then order books directly from the state library collection, so that the larger -- after all, in Vermont the largest community is 40,000. They are not effective.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You can choose books only from the list? You can't demand a book that isn't on the list?

MR. LAUBACH: That's correct. Not in this particular program, yes, sir.

One thing that I would like to emphasize is that this books-by-mail service has been reaching people who have not been using the public library -- "I cannot get there. I do not drive. I am homebound. My library is only open Tuesday and Thursday afternoon" -- this sort of thing, and it has not resulted in being a competitive service at all versus the community library. It has been entirely supplementary.

MR. LORENZ: Is it a free service?

MR. LAUBACH: Yes, and at the moment the state is paying postage both ways.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: As a man of figures, since I see you are an accountant, would you be willing to make a comment on how well off or how badly off are the people in Vermont in terms of library services?

MR. LAUBACH: Some are quite badly off. Small communities, who tend to think of themselves as poor, perhaps support their community library to the tune of 50 cents per capita per year, a dollar per capita per year; and consequently they have what I am sure everyone in this room would consider very inadequate service -- small collections, open very limited hours or perhaps unattractive and crowded facilities. So service in many communities is not good. So service in many communities is not good.

The state does supplement this. It has provided bookmobile service which has not been discontinued, but the book collections are still available through regional offices of the state, from regional collections, and the librarians may make their selections and then have them delivered to their library.

The library that does have an alert librarian but very limited funds will borrow several hundred books perhaps quarterly from the state collecction, so this service is available, but it is certainly nowhere near what the people living in metropolitan areas experience for their service.

Another factor that I think is important: Unfortunately, it is not known as universally as it should be, but a library loan can be obtained through the local librarian, so that whatever is available in the state or perhaps in an adjacent state is available, but that doesn't say that it gets used.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Velde.

MR. VELDE: Jim, I think that some of your ideas are pleasant to reflect on as far as people taking care of themselves, but we find very, very few cases where revenue-sharing really does well, even where people try -- it does not do well; and I just hope that your experience in Vermont is better with revenue-sharing, but it is a pleasant concept.

MR. LAUBACH: Well, in my view, Bud, if you do not get it through revenue-sharing, get it out of the town. If the community library is part of the town operation, then it is part of the town budget and the trustees and the librarians need to stress their own importance and their own needs. I don't think we necessarily need to look for Washington either for categorical grants or for revenue-sharing.

MR. VELDE: But for libraries it is difficult to prove a thing like the cost benefit to a library.

MR. LAUBACH: It is. Again, it is a year-round job of publicity, if you can do it at all.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: I would like to know whether your interlibrary loan service has been used very extensively or not.

MR. LAUBACH: I just can't answer that as a local ex-trustee because I am not exposed to the figures. I do know that it is available and I do know that it does get used; and if a person is aware of it, they can ask for it. If a librarian is alert and is trying to be helpful, as many of course are, by saying, "Well, we don't have it so we will put it through a library loan and see if we can get it elsewhere."

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Laubach.

MR. LAUBACH: May I make one remark further?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Certainly.

MR. LAUBACH: That is concerning the draft that was distributed, and that has to do with the national library network.

Having gone through it and then giving it a few thoughts, I come to Mr. Velde's comment concerning cost benefits, and I think there is a real problem here.

I would have to raise these questions to the Commission: If there was such a network, who would use it? Who is the public? What people or what kinds of people are intended to be benefitted by this? Who needs it?

Secondly, what do they need or what kind of information? Where are they?

I just have the feeling that we do have interlibrary loan, we do have community collections, we do have backup state libraries and academic libraries, and I am wondering if a network which obviously would be instituted at great expense, if there is a real overwhelming need for the kind of information that the network can make available all over the country.

One of the comments that my letter had to do with was interlibrary cooperation, and I am all for that and I am all for sharing facilities. Personally I would rather see it at the local level, where we have a school library that is closed so many months a year and it closes at whatever time it is in the afternoon and it has racks, books, magazines and a library and lighted space; and across the street we have a public library with the same things. Maybe a couple of blocks away we have an academic library with the same things but different collections, to be sure, serving different publics, having different purposes.

But I raise the question: Are we taxpayers getting the best that we can out of these various staffs and facilities and collections? I think there is a great deal that needs to be done at the local level, and here the problem is right before our very eyes.

[Continued on following page]

Lib.
Conf.
10/3

TA-RS/mef-1

fols.TF

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Laubach. Now we come to the portion of the hearings that we devote to public testimony. We have followed the practice in the past in these regional hearings of allowing an hour and a half to two hours at lunchtime for people who have not, for one reason or another, sent in testimony but who would like to come and make some kind of a statement to the Commission. In that connection I now have a list of eleven people who have signed up, and if you divide the time available up between those people, it means ten minutes each, and we are already 20 minutes behind time.

So, when I call on these people I want you to bear in mind that you must be succinct in your statements if we are to be fair to all of the other people who are waiting, and I also want the Commission members to make their questions short and to the point.

Now, this also means that the Commission does not break for lunch. You will see one or two of us peel off from time to time, and that means we are going into the next room to have a sandwich or something, but most of us will be around to hear what is being said, and I would urge some of the Commission members -- I don't know how you want to decide when to go -- but just disappear when you are hungry but don't leave this table empty.

All right. May I now call on Mr. Bowen of MIT, Mr. C. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Ten minutes?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes, and shorter if you want us to ask you any questions.

MR. BOWEN: You won't have the basis for asking the questions unless I read a little, so let me burden you.

I am sorry I am not prepared with copies for you to follow as I read the three parts of my paper. One is the telecommunications environment generally as it will affect library services in the future, a rather specific statement of that environment, going into transmission, long-haul/short-haul issues, local switching issues and then a rhetorical close called Impact of the Telecommunication Environment particularly on public libraries.

I will begin with an overview of what I see as the telecommunications environment for say a decade hence.

We assume the following structure for the telecommunication service industry about a decade or so hence. The assumption is based on a rather straightforward extrapolation from the capabilities of the existing communication plant and current technology, and some simple premises about marked demand. It also assumes the continuation of the existing legal regulatory framework, which is a highly suppositional presumption.

First on local service: Local service will consist essentially of two independent transmission systems each providing a basic service that will yield a substantial revenue base of its own.

First, a telephone network using"twisted pair" wire distribution intended primarily for voice communication but also capable of delivering other, more demanding communication services such as digital data and videophone. The head end is designed to provide very rapid and flexible nationwide interconnections. It will have essentially a 100 percent market penetration, including rural areas, for telephone service but only very limited penetration of videophone service. With appropriate terminal equipment, the network can be readily designed to provide additional services such as automatic burglar and fire alarms, transmitting and recording instrument readings(utility meters, EKG's, et cetera). It is worth noting that some fields of medicine such as pediatrics already rely heavily on the telephone system for delivery of health care.

Second, there will be a wideband or video cable distribution system with capability for some upstream communication flow, either voice or small data rate messages, with perhaps some limited number of two-way channels available for switched local service. Penetration will be high. We estimate on the order of 45 to 70 percent in densely populated areas, but only scattered service will be available to exurban and rural areas except if subsidized by the government.

On the local level, TV distribution is not a natural outgrowth of the kind of service the telephone company now provides,nor can it utilize the telephone plant effectively except for rights-of-way and telephone poles; so continued growth of an independent cable system can be expected. I will have a caveat about that later. The FCC policy, agreed to by the telephone company, is that the telephone company will not enter the CATV market.

Under the second section, National Long-Haul Services, we predict it will consist primarily of the long-lines telephone plant utilizing microwaves, cable and satellite transmission systems with high capacity waveguides being introduced in certain high-traffic routes as, for example, between New York and Philadelphia.

But in addition to the telephone plant carrying the bulk of the nation's traffic, there would be some special service networks for such purposes as television distribution, data service, other non-voice communications and possibly some electronic delivery of mail. I am talking about long-haul transmission now.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Bowen, could you summarize these because you are never going to get through in the time available if you read the whole thing.

MR. BOWEN: I have got four minutes down.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have got 16 pages of text.

MR. BOWEN: I am planning to skip.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Good.

MR. BOWEN: The basic policy questions that arise in local communication relate to the issue of which of the two local distribution systems should handle such new communications services as can be developed for education, home shopping, health care, payments, et cetera when there are no compelling technical or economic reasons to utilize one or the other of the local distribution systems. One approach would be to let the free market struggle with alternative systems for a while with the hope that an optimal solution would emerge; but the high capital cost and short-term inefficiency of this approach might be compensated for by the lower costs and higher efficiency realized in the long term.

On the national level, the long-haul telephone plant can very naturally expand its facilities to handle virtually all communication needs. The reasons for opening

ERASABLE
RAG CONTENT

the market to the new long-haul carriers other than AT&T are, it seems to us, self-evident.

Number one, some services can be provided at lower prices since the rate structure of the telephone company is such that some customers, particularly those in remote areas and those using a small amount of capacity, are subsidized and others overcharged. Consequently, the overcharged group provides a ready market for specialized new telecommunication carriers.

Second, the existence, or even the threat of competition might hasten the introduction of new telecommunication services. Regulatory processes,internal priorities and internal bureaucratic considerations often slow down the telephone company's initiatives.

And third, there is considerable apprehension on the part of the government and the industry about a single national communication carrier with monopoly power despite the presumed efficiency of scale and reliability of service that a single large carrier might provide.

Well/ I will skip now to the more detailed examination of the issues raised generally in that front section to some concerns I have about the impact of the telecommunications environment on future library development.

TA

RS/mef-7

The enriched national and international ability to communicate, person to person, place to place, can impact the total library community, but alas, the precedents are poor. Libraries, like other educational or service bureacracies are conservative, highly fragmented, and unlike education or health, hold insufficient critical mass in the local or national decision-making.

What stirs the imagination is the use that some libraries could make of telecommunications if..., and my concluding remarks will be addressed to some of those "if's." Let me preface these, however, by focusing my concern on public libraries because in any formulation of library futures, one sees library networks, community information centers and research libraries as major modes of development. The research libraries, be they national, those of major cities, or universities of scale, will respond to their telecommunications opportunities as natural response to their environment. Interconnection will add range to their present text and visual reference functions, and local distribution loops, by more imaginative use of voice-grade transmission or large bandwidth capacity, will add flexibility to their delivery. So I would exclude from my remarks specific concerns for research libraries or the community information centers. It is the public library, operating in two distinct spheres, in the middle-sized cities and in rural America, whose use of telecommunications engages my interest.

Urban America as a conception lacks specificity as a definition, but there are fewer than 800 cities in America with population of over 30,000, and once the top hundred are skimmed, one finds a city of character if not definition more akin to the village than the metropolis. This middle-sized American city is rich in pride and proud of its institutions, its growth and its role and sense of place in its region. Yet it is removed geographically from the mega-cities, major centers of culture, sources of entertainment, major information repositories. The public library in such a mid-sized American city has a first-class opportunity for use of telecommunications; and I summarize information which the Commission probably is well aware of as we are at MIT of some of the experiments that have been going on in middle-sized cities, but I think these illustrations, the Casper, Wyoming, the Bakersfield, California examples, are really designed to illustrate the point that it is in this area that communications, telecommunications can serve.

I want to concentrate my time and remarks on rural America because it seems to me the libraries

ERASABLE

serving rural America, particularly the Eastern United States and most particularly rural New England, derive their continued existence from dogged tradition and unmitigated personal sacrifice by the town librarian. For these institutions in these towns, or townships as they would be called west of the Alleghenies, the future is as bleak as the present, and both less promising than the past.

Rural America, you know, holds a quarter of our citizenry, and if towns under 10,000 are added, nearly half our population is accounted for. Life in rural America has been greatly improved thanks to rural electrification, subsequently extended to rural telephony. But this improvement comes at a high cost. An examination of telephone tariff structures indicates the very high price of living in rural America, running half-again as much for basic service plus local tolls as do tariffs for adjacent metropolitan regions. Rural America by definition is sparsely populated, raising the cost of service delivery; but it is also very poor, proportionate to metropolitan America, and thus least able to pay for its service deliveries.

Rural youth are one year behind urban youth in their education, given the same grade level. But this is symptom, not cause.

It strikes me that the town library in rural America is probably in greater need of telecommunications services than any of the other library sectors. The resources are pathetically few. They have an historic tradition of service in a delimited range, and a capacity to survive while starving for human and material resources.

The specific things, it seems to me, that telecommunications can provide for a rural library are these: First, it can help achieve what politically has been impossible to gain; namely, aggregation to minimum critical mass of resources in order to serve effectively. A town library dies even harder than a scholarly journal, and its trustees are always more ready to fight than merge. Yet common sense, not systems analysis, dictates that the service area must be enlarged in order that requisite tools be gained for local use, be those tools reference collections, visual programming or adult basic education.

Second, the rural library in order to be effective, must be able to deliver its services door to door. The transportation resources that urban areas and metropolitan areas provide simply aren't there otherwise. But for pre-schoolers, for out-of-school young adults, for employed adults, most of whom are reachable by television, either broadcast or cable, the post and telephone are useful but partial solutions.

Third, the rural library desperately needs a Washington-based advocate and it has never known one. The short-lived romance between libraries and the educational lobby led to a marriage of convenience between schools and educationally related libraries, but left the poor relations, rural public libraries, without a voice or home in federal budgeting priorities. The Commission is the logical, and perhaps the only, vehicle for such advocacy. It may be within its charter to avoid responsible advocacy for its constituents, but it will morally abort its mission as it does so.

And the most specific cause in which they need support is the cause of additional communication services.

Let me offer two comments in closing. Left to the growth of the market, our economists estimate that 40 percent of rural America would still be without electricity if R.E.A. hadn't come along offering marginal federal intervention through the economies of scale that produced lower construction costs per mile of electrification, and loaned money at preferred rates to utilities and rural electric cooperatives to manage the increased distribution. Similarly, it is hard to remember that as short a time back as the end of World War II, less than half of America had telephones. Now, thanks in large part to the same federal intervention, the telephone is almost as ubiquitous as power and light.

Communications services to rural America can only be enlarged by federal intervention. Rural electrification could and should be extended, for example, to cable television, as it was to telephony. And rural service institutions, particularly the rural library, need improved communication resources in order to survive and serve.

[Continued on following page.]

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you. We will see to it that your paper is duplicated and passed around to the other members of the Commission. We would also be very interested in your reaction to this draft of a national program which I take it you have not yet seen.

MR. BOWEN: I haven't, but my remarks by agreement with Chuck were to be addressed strictly to the telecommunications environment.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Please do write to us about how you respond to the national program, too.

MR. LERNER: One quick one. You say you look forward to a 40 to 70 percent penetration of market in broad-band communication. What is your time frame on that?

MR. BOWEN: I am sorry --

MR. LERNER: The cable industry today is a total disaster; so what is your time frame on that?

MR. BOWEN: Will you qualify your total disaster if I qualify my 30 to 45? My reference to 30 to 45 percent was, I think, specific to one level of service; not to --

MR. LERNER: 40 to 70.

MR. BOWEN: 45 to 70 in densely populated areas; not for rural America.

MR. LERNER: *What is your time frame?*

MR. BOWEN: A decade.

MR. AINES: Your telephone number, is that in your document?

MR. BOWEN: Chuck has it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Okay.

MS. MOORE: Of all places to be concerned about rural libraries, I am deeply impressed that MIT should be so concerned, and I want to compliment the witness. I am very much impressed with your testimony.

MR. BOWEN; I am also a citizen of the State of Vermont and have just taken the free man's oath, so I represent two minority constituencies.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much. Now I would like to call on Ms. Jewel Drickhamer of the Rhode Island Department of State Library Services. I notice that you and the next four speakers all come from the same Department of State Library Services.

MS. DRICKHAMER: I thought they had successfully divided themselves up for the sake of everybody listening, but some of them may or may not proceed to speak. I will be brief. I am sure you will be glad for that.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You understand our problem.

MS. DRICKHAMER: Yes.

RS/mef-3

I have had the opportunity to see two drafts of your present paper, and there is a great deal of good thinking in these drafts. National planning is essential, and Rhode Island did press for it. A national network is of importance to at least a good segment of our population.

In my opinion, however, the document is very narrow in scope and your articulation of funding is also very narrow. It leaves out of the national posture rather effectively services to children, young people, elderly, minorities, all the goals we have been developing toward people-oriented programs, and it is my opinion that states and localities cannot succeed in developing and continuing to develop these services without federal funds and federal impact. I feel that there should be national goals that encompass both those in your paper and other user-oriented goals.

To put it bluntly in money terms, if there were $100 million federal for libraries, I should like to see twenty million annually for some sort of super-network which perhaps really is needed and eighty million annually to go intrastate for at least a decade to continue to raise the level and quality of library services to citizens right where they are in ways that we are beginning to learn to be effective in.

I realize that you may feel that the services to these groups are implied in your document by "letting the states do it" or even the locality. I think the realities are in my mind that 25 percent of our population may never use libraries; that 25 percent may already use libraries; that there are 50 percent who could use libraries to their profit but somehow or another we are not reaching them or able to serve them maximally. This is for a variety of reasons but chiefly because the good, sound middle or upper middle class that began libraries and backed them dominated them for a long time.

I think we have made a start in another direction. I should hate to see this start not have a continual federal posture to back it and the funds to continue it. In my opinion until we reach the hard-hat fathers and the welfare mothers and the radio addict kids and all the others who need to read and gain information in order to have a full and informed life, we can end up creating networks or a super network that talk to themselves or to itself and to a very small audience; so I make this very sincere plea that there be consideration in this way.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any questions?

[No response.]

Next is Mr. Richard Waters.

MR. WATERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't know Rhode Island was going to dominate the open session.

CHM. BURKHARDT: It speaks well for your initiative, I must say.

MR. WATERS: I would like to make two brief points. One is that I am for categorical grants. It is through categorical grants that we have been able to put some pressure on the local communities to live up to national priorities and to standards.

And a new federalism of revenue-sharing -- I have been keeping a close watch on this, and Mr. Stevens at Wentworth last week said that the Treasury Department seems to think that 5 percent of revenue-sharing money is going for public libraries. We did a very close study in Rhode Island, and out of $15 million to the communities in Rhode Island in 1972, something like .00259 percent was given to public libraries.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Who gave the 5 percent figure?

MR. WATERS: Mr. Stevens mentioned it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Our Mr. Stevens?

MR. WATERS: Yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We will have to ask him where he got it.

MR. WATERS: He said he got it from the Treasury Department; and from the 1973 amount of revenue-sharing, which was approximately $15 million at the local communities, .00253 percent went to public libraries. And I have been watching the revenue-sharing and I think the local officials have been burned. They thought there were going to be categorical grants along with revenue-sharing and with the sudden demise of the funds for categorical grants, they have been spending the money on one-shot deals where they are buying fire engines and nothing is going for programs.

Of the money in Rhode Island that went for revenue-sharing, less than $5,000 is for programs. It has gone for roof repairs, new furnaces, boilers and that sort of thing.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have got pretty solid statistics, I gather. You are really keeping track of that?

MR. WATERS: Yes; and secondly, I would like to -- the National Commission in all its papers mentioned the fact there should be a national structure and various people have mentioned the Library of Congress as the focal point. I say there is already an existing structure. Mr. Brown pointed out that it has fluctuated over the years with various people coming and going, but there is a structure there within the Department of HEW that perhaps needs to be boosted. We have the structure. We have people in Washington who are concerned with library programs who have had the experience. We have regional offices, and perhaps at this point of our national structure this is the place to start. There is something already in existence.

Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

Mr. Casey?

MR. CASEY: Will you please tell me why haven't trustees and librarians been more convincing, more effective in getting revenue-sharing funds? This is a serious situation because libraries are listed among the categories that can be used in revenue-sharing along with public safety and so forth. Why have libraries been so unsuccessful in your experience?

MR. WATERS: We had a meeting. I believe it was mentioned earlier by Marylou -- I always have trouble with the last name. Our department has had a state-wide meeting on revenue-sharing with public officials, with state officials and librarians and trustees, and most of the public officials, town managers and city managers said that librarians and the public who use the library don't scream.

I will quote one mayor whose community gets almost $3 million. He says that if 15 firemen come in and scream for a new fire truck, they will get a new fire truck, but I think the traditional librarians have traditionally been quiet, the same as the trustees. They have fought in town budgets in that area, but they will not go out, and they don't see the role of a librarian -- and as one having had experience of going out in the public and being cautioned by my trustees not to -- but I think also the officials have been burned. This is a chance to get equipment and other things for the community without going to raise taxes, and if they can update all their fire equipment and all their police equipment, they think this is more vital than the library, and most of the people will agree with them.

MR. CASEY: You are saying as a matter of priority the trustees and librarians have to establish a higher priority in their community for library service?

MR. WATERS: Not so much a priority. I think in many cases you have got 15 policemen coming in, they are going to get the publicity because people will be concerned about public safety. I think if you could get 200 people coming in supporting the library for revenue-sharing, they will get as much as anybody else will.

ERASABLE
RAG CONTENT

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you. The Commission is really anxious to get as complete a picture of how this whole revenue-sharing is working out as far as libraries are concerned, and we are finding it rather difficult because the returns come in in very spotty ways, but we are making every effort to get the picture as it is working out.

MR. WATERS: I can send our questionnaire and how we outlined it and the result we are getting. In order to prepare for this, I had to do some telephoning to about ten libraries who hadn't responded to the questionnaire, but by telephone I got the information.

MS. MOORE: I would caution even the members of the audience to carefully look behind the statistics. In my own state of Arkansas the state revenue-sharing, the amount that went to the state, everyone knew went to highways, all of it. But when the reporting system came around, it was said that the revenue-sharing had been put in with the state monies and, therefore, it could not be said for sure exactly what they were spent for. And so the legislature, the legislative council which did the reporting indicated that $2 million had gone for libraries because there had been a $2 million-appropriation to improve the collections in the university library. It left the impression that we profited greatly from revenue-sharing in Arkansas. That is, the records of the Treasury Department will show that, and it was, as I said at the time, it was inaccurate and if I had not been employed by the state, I would have said dishonest reporting.

[Laughter.]

MR. WATERS: I can't answer for the states here because that has gone into the general fund, but the libraries -- and by far one of the questions we asked them was how did they have to keep track of revenue-sharing funds and how did their town do it. Most of the communities have set up a special budget. You have your regular budget and then each department applies for revenue-sharing and they have to keep separate reports; so, on the state level I wouldn't know, but on the community level we have a fairly accurate picture.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

Ms. Barbara Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity. I am Barbara Wilson, Chief of the Special Library Services in the Department of State Library Services in Rhode Island, and this seems to be Rhode Island predominating the lunch hour. However, I did have

Hemlock
ERASABLE

the opportunity to present written testimony, so I will not repeat what I have put in there, but I did want to emphasize a couple of additional thoughts that I have and my concerns.

I am concerned mainly with readers who need special library services. They would be the blind, the handicapped and the institutionalized; and also I coordinate media services. And I don't know. I suppose you must realize what impact the federal funds have had on library programs for this special clientele.

In Rhode Island we did not have a regional library until LSCA came along and we had 200 readers transferred from Perkins which have now grown to over 2,000 readers served by our regional library in Rhode Island.

We do share materials from the Library of Congress and we also develop peripheral materials ourselves to serve special needs such as some of the language needs that we have in Rhode Island. But besides that, we have ten state institutions in Rhode Island and these had no library services when the LSCA came in. Now five of them have full-time librarians who are employed by the institutions. They were originally started under grants from our agency and have shown their need and services in institutions to the point where now the institution funds them. Five other institutions either get bookmobile service through us or they have part-time librarians who are working and hoping that they will eventually also be picked up. But without federal money, we would never have been able to do this type of library service, and it is most essential. While you need this overall network, you also must not cut back on this kind of supportive funding for special services.

I also have the concern as far as the media goes with incompatibility. It is really appalling the amounts, the kinds, the types of equipment, both hardware and software, none of which are interchangeable or compatible. If you go from one meeting to another, you have to supply your own slide projecter because your carousel might not fit on someone else's. The films are not all interchangeable between the eight, the super-eight, the 16 millimeters; even the cassettes where the speed now is in size pretty much compatible, even there there are problems with impulses on certain cassettes and things like that.

Then comes video tape which is a whole area that needs to be standardized. I think it is going in that direction, but your body agency could encourage the standardization and the use of media in a more sensible manner so that people aren't spending thousands and

/mef-13

thousands of dollars to duplicate and develop materials which are not compatible with one another.

I know this is a problem industry-wise because naturally the person wants to sell his own machine, but still where it was possible to standardize other things nationally such as cassette tapes and things like that, I think in this direction this is where an overall agency, by setting up standards, you could force the elimination and enforce, encourage the compatibility of materials for special library services.

MR. LERNER: Because of a cut in federal funding, have you been forced to drop some programs directly, and if so --

MS. WILSON: We have been fortunate in Rhode Island that our director has got matching state money. For practically all of the federal money we have a matching state component; so, what we have done is go along on a very reduced scale where we have not been able to expand when we had planned to expand. We have a five-year plan which has not been able -- we are not able to implement all of that and we probably won't be able to unless things look brighter for us.

We have not been able to add other institutions or partially state-supported institutions which we had hoped to do such as halfway houses, drug homes, places like this, where the institutions are reducing in size and their residents are going home into the communities. They are living in special halfway houses and group homes, and these would benefit greatly by library services. And the public libraries are not either geared or trained or for several reasons they just can't take care of the special clientele, and we would be doing that if we had more federal funding.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Ms. Wilson. Ms. Dorothy Brown.

Ms. Brown, do you have a statement you would like to read?

MS. BROWN: No. I am also from the Rhode Island Department of State Library Services and most of the things that I was concerned that should be said have already been mentioned at some time this morning.

I would only like to say, as other people have already said, that I do approve of the draft proposal. I think the establishment of a national network is an important thing, but I am also concerned for those library users present and possible who really could benefit very little by the network but can benefit from a continuation of the programs which have already been started and many of which are still in a very, very preliminary stage and which may die or not continue if the setup of funding is drastically changed at this point.

MR. LERNER: Your concern then basically is that funds should not go into the network program that come out of other programs. We should continue to do what we are doing.

MS. BROWN: Right.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Do you interpret that draft as being an alternative or a substitute for categorical aid? The connection isn't necessarily so, but I see your point just the same. Our motive is to get on with some kind of national plan, and I think insofar as the federal component of that is concerned, we are trying to specify what the state responsibilities are in establishing a federal plan of this sort. I don't think it's necessarily to be interpreted that we, as a commission, in this plan have any other position about federal funding.

The amount of federal funding or what it is is to be determined by what we discover to be the needs of the country and the mechanisms for providing the funds; so I don't know whether I may be answering a question which you never had.

MS. BROWN: What I was primarily concerned with after reading the document is that all of the emphasis is on systems, on providing information which I think is very necessary, but there are no mention of many of the types of library users that I am familiar with and do help to serve, such as children, for example, who would benefit very little from this type of national network, from the elderly who come in to use a library for informational reading, for leisure reading and so forth, for handicappers which Ms. Wilson has already talked about.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Very good. We will do something about that. Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Alberto Pereira.

Mr. Pereira, would you proceed.

MR. PEREIRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and commission members, for letting me speak. I already have a statement to the Commission. What I would like to talk about is my position as supervisor of young reader services which is in the Department of State Library Services.

My job is contact with people, with children for whom I do story hours, storytelling, providing special programs which are concerned with children, books for children, special programs entailing speakers for librarians to hear, those people who work with children's books. In particular, much of my service in the past five years has taken me into the community where I have discussed with young adults who found the library the place they wanted to discuss such things as drugs, drug use, drug abuse, what library services they preferred.

I have tape-recorded young adults and younger children from 11 to 12 years old on what they preferred in the library for services for them.

T-C

In an, I think, excellent program of cooperation between the Department and the principal public library in Providence, we managed a series of programs wherein we purchased books for various community organizations such as the Afro-American Center, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a small community club, a social club comprised of the poor in which we got together and purchased books for these people which they selected, and this program would not have been possible without the federal funding which gave the impetus that we needed.

I think the document is an excellent document, but I think it is guilty of omission, omission of mention of children, of the various minority groups with which I work, and I think a very much-needed content to be added is a parallel development to this document which would include children and the minorities.

Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

Any questions? Thank you.

I call on Barbara Holden. Ms. Holden is from the New Hampshire State Library Commission; right?

MS. HOLDEN: Yes, I am, Mr. Burkhardt. I apologize for not having submitted testimony in advance. However, I choose to speak at this moment from the point of view of a former library trustee from a small town.

Before I say what I have to say, and I do promise to be brief, I would like to say that I do, as a member of the state library commission, I do not obviously agree with what Mr. Laubach has had to say about the necessity for federal funds. As a member and as someone from New Hampshire, I am delighted to see that we are represented by our academic libraries because this proves what marvelous cooperation we have had from them in building our statewide network.

I do, however, agree with what Mr. Laubach had to say as far as the importance of establishing coordination, cooperation, networks at the local level. Mr. Kissner from Fitchburg also made this point. I feel very strongly about it right at this moment because I have been working for the last several months on a study which has been privately funded by the New Hampshire Charitable Fund to determine the degree and kind of cooperation or coordination which is possible in the libraries of a small town of 6,000 in New Hampshire.

I think this is a fairly typical case. We have been working in the state with the cooperation of the State Department of Education and the state library and of the boards of both agencies on this problem for sometime. We have been carrying -- we have conducted regional meetings throughout the state, some of which I have attended. This, plus my own experience in working on this library surveying in collaboration with the professional school librarian, convinces me that at the local level we are not going to make real progress in cooperation and coordination until or unless there are funds to pay someone to really make the in-depth study which is necessary in each specific case. I don't mean that all the answers are different. Each borrows from the other, but they are to a very large extent individual answers, and in small communities I do not think that there is going to be the incentive or the time or the energy to pursue this sort of thing unless the Department of Education and the library services get together and make joint grants which will make this sort of thing possible.

I speak from the point of view of the rural communities rather than the large communities, I realize.

ERASABLE
RAG CONTENT

Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ms. Holden, would you see to it that our staff has a record of this study that you talked about?

MS. HOLDEN: Yes, indeed I will. We are in process.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Is that being done under the Library Commission?

MS. HOLDEN: No, it is not. I should have said that the application for this grant was made by the Board of Trustees of the Richards Library in Newport, New Hampshire, because they could see that ten years from now both the school libraries and the public libraries might well be falling behind in service and in resources unless the taxpayer could be assured that he was getting the greatest possible value for his library dollar.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Is your commission a coordinating body? Is it an advisory body? What is it?

MS. HOLDEN: Our state library commission is like Ms. Moore's state library commission, I would say, and our state agency is the coordinating agency for all library efforts in the state certainly.

Our program is basically for public libraries, but the academic libraries have been pulled in, and we are trying to pull in more and more as time goes on.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much. I call on Ms. Eleanor Cairns from Maine. There are abbreviations here, but I believe it is the Maine Medical Center Library.

MS. CAIRNS: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I think that you might be interested to know of a horse-and-buggy kind of library service that we are giving in Maine. The Maine Medical Center and the Biosciences Library, Jackson Library in Bar Harbor are committed to continuing medical education in the State of Maine. You know, we have no medical school and the Maine Medical Center has the largest medical library in the state, so we are a resource for every physician in the State of Maine. We received seed money from the regional medical program to finance our document delivery, reference services, loan of books and cassettes and so forth, and that has been has been going on for a period of five years.

In June we came to the end of our funding and wondered what do we do now. Well, as you know, we are Yankees from Maine and so we make do, eat it up, wear it out and so forth. So what we did was to go out and try to raise money from the doctors who are using this service. It didn't seem possible and many people said that it would fail. We haven't admitted to failure yet, and I think we

Hemlock
ERASABLE

are not going to.

There are 60 hospitals in the State of Maine. We have memberships in our medical library for service for 27 of these libraries (sic). We have ten that will get their checks to us eventually for service. That leaves a few small hospitals, some 23-bed hospitals, some 30-bed hospitals and so forth. But those of us in the library say what happens to the patient who is getting care from a doctor who is practicing medicine the way he did 40 years ago when he graduated from medical school? We're just as concerned and we feel that they are as entitled to good medical care as anyone in the state.

Having a committed staff, it is rather easy and extremely rewarding to give service to the doctors in the state. However, on the periphery of this circle of doctors who are supporting the program, we have the paramedical personnel, we have the nurses, the technicians of various kinds, and these people are not provided for. It is my great concern that if the country is truly concerned about improved patient care and continuing medical education on every level, that they will know about the things that are happening in our state.

And we are just an example. We are a rural state with hospitals very far apart. We are at the moment talking about consortia, and it is possible that two of our cities may be able to establish a consortium in each city. However, you can't consult with anybody who is 50 to 75 miles away from you. They have to be fairly near, and so this is a very real problem for us: how to get service to the physicians in the outlying areas and, furthermore, to the paramedical personnel.

There is no duplication of service in our state. As I said, we have no medical school and ours is the largest library and we have made this commitment. And so we are thinking in terms of newer kinds of communication.

We have had financed for us by Regional Medical Program the teletype, the TWX, a WATS line and now we have gone into computer service, the MED line. We are part of the national medical library situation, but there is always that time -- this hasn't really gone into effect yet, and I understand that it will be going into effect in January, but in the meantime we have the questions we must answer now, the patients who are ill now, the doctor who needs a review now; and so we hope that eventually we will make this program something more than it is, something in the 20th century; not mailing out documents through the post office, but having some kind of I think it is called photophone kind of service that we can give so that a doctor from the northern reaches of the state won't call in and say, "If you can get this material to me by Wednesday, I'll postpone the operation until Thursday." This really happened. And we make use of Greyhound buses, whatever we can to get the information to him as fast as possible.

We have a very great responsibility here, and I think that perhaps there isn't any place in the planning that I have listened to here for helping us, but I think you should be aware that these things are existing in rural areas in particular.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

Mr. Dunlap?

MR. DUNLAP: How do the physicians and your paramedical personnel in Maine learn about your collections? Does a physician ordinarily subscribe to the Journal of the American Medical Association, find a particular publication he wants to see or are you able to send them lists of your new acquisitions?

MS. CAIRNS: We send our list out over the state. Many of the medical meetings are held at our hospital, and doctors come in for grand rounds very often, usually once a week. I have visited probably 80 percent of the hospitals in Maine. I have talked with administrators about establishing small basic libraries, but it is very difficult to sit opposite a man on a limited budget who is wondering how he is going to repair the ceiling in one wing of the hospital, how he is going to get new equipment for the operating room, and he thinks, my God, she's talking about books. He just can't believe it, it is so unreal to him. However, 50 percent of all the interns, 50 percent of the men who intern at our hospital stay in the state of Maine or return to the state of Maine. They know perfectly well about our hospital and we can almost pinpoint them on the map of Maine where they go because the last thing they ask as they leave the building is, "You will give library service to us now, won't you?" And we say yes.

Now we are on a pay-as-you-go, but we have not as yet refused anybody and I think perhaps we won't refuse service to anyone.

MR. LERNER: Is there a lesson to be learned from your pattern of operation for other states?

MS. CAIRNS: Perhaps not. I think that we are starting in a very small way. I think that some day some person will see the possibilities of what could be done with increasing this kind of service, having more trained medical librarians in the state, having a larger central library, having faster communication, having better -- we are on the MED line which is the medical network for computer service -- having a better computer service. I see this as a small beginning of something that will have to grow and I do feel that people should be aware of small efforts so that they don't die out, so that they are continued and increased.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

I would like to call Mr. Joseph Sakey, Cambridge Public Library.

MR. SAKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to say a few words. I think it is a fact of life that we have not responded to here -- most of the speakers except for the delegation from Rhode Island -- that 80 to 90 percent of the public who lives in an urban setting do not use libraries. It seems to me that the Commission's proposal that I happened to look at this morning does not respond to this fact of life.

It seems to me that the use of the consumer and user as has been used here this morning has been used in an adjectival computer sense. That the real meaningful program, national plan to service the people in the urban settings, I just don't see it in what I hear and what I have read.

There has been no mention of the relevancy of libraries in the urban setting where the middle class are totally absent, where we have the poor and the disadvantaged, where we have got the blacks and the Portugese and the Spanish and the Indians and French and others, where we have a large white disadvantaged population. No mention or conversation has been given in a programatic way to find the needs of these persons living in the city.

For all practical purposes one can say that books are dead in the urban centers. We have not responded to that. The tradition of reading is a dying tradition in the cities, and I am not sure that anyone can dispute that. It is my opinion that the networks, the computer systems, the consoles, the inter-library loans do not -- and I want to emphasize that very strongly -- do not respond to the people's needs in an urban setting.

I submit that any kind of a network of this sort will serve less than one percent, if one percent, probably less, of the total American population. I think it is incumbent on this Commission to really respond to the needs of an urban setting which is where, I understand, two-thirds of the total population lives. It seems to me that alternatives and new goals and new objectives for an urban library situation are required, whether it is informational referral systems, whether it is cultural centers, whether it is a learning situation, whether it is a teaching situation, whether it is a telecommunications system, but some new role, meaningful role that will take the people in an urban setting into mind. This kind of a program is very, very necessary.

Just lastly, it is one that I don't like publicly to say, but there is a sense of disappointment I have had in Cambridge when we heard the rallying cry from librarians all over the country. We had libraries rallying all over the country. We had state agencies screaming and yelling all over the country. We had state associations yelling and crying all over the country because of Mr. Nixon's tax cut or library cut on the LSCA funds. It is disappointing to me to see the Commission was silent while all this activity was going on. I think I would be remiss in my responsibilities not to say this in a public setting.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

MR. CASEY: May I ask -- I agree with the problems that you are referring to in terms of minorities and underprivileged people in our urban areas. Now, why aren't the local governments and the state governments responding to that and let the Commission address itself to the delivery of interstate library service?

MR. SAKEY: I am concerned about this because, you know, there isn't a city -- you know, you ask about revenue-sharing. I think the real answer is that politicians have to survive and politicians in this area to survive this time around in elections had to reduce taxes and that is where most of your money went. I think you know there simply isn't enough money around. All the network business, for example, that has happened has not reached the little library. It has not reached the library like Cambridge. We have got a few added services, but those services were again geared for the one percent or five percent and not to the 80 percent.

The categorical grants that we have been getting from the state library commission as a result of the LSCA funds have been real meaningful to us in Cambridge. In a real meaningful way they have touched the lives of the Spanish and blacks and other poor in the city. Now, any system that is going to come in is going to siphon off this kind of money from any kind of categorical grants that Cambridge or any other small city can have; and I am submitting that these categorical grants are real meaningful. Any other system is just, in my opinion, giving us more of the same, and more of the same simply isn't working; just isn't working.

I think it is an insult to me -- we have talked about the slanderous results -- this fellow that spoke earlier, Mr. DeBuse -- the fact is that from Cleveland to Newark to Detroit and Boston and Cambridge and all the great urban centers, 90 percent of the people are asked to support a library system that only 10 percent use, and there is very little in those library systems which can attract or bring the 90 percent in. There just simply isn't that kind of money. We have got to either reallocate our goals or objectives, and that has to come from some very high level.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu?

MS. WU: Do you mean that the reason why the Cambridge Library systems haven't been able to reach -- does that mean the library system, the reason why they haven't been able to reach the minorities is totally the lack of funds?

MR. SAKEY: Whatever effort we have made in Cambridge to reach the minorities has been as a result of the state grants-in-aid. It is very, very difficult to begin to change a middle-class philosophy where you have been catering and meeting the needs of a middle-class clientele for a number of years. This middle class of clientele happens to be the Establishment, the 5 or 10 percent, the influence-makers, and they are not going to allow you to begin changing and using current operating resources to reallocate to change a whole philosophy in meeting the needs of the poor. This has to emanate from a national plan, a national goal in my opinion.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Dunlap?

MR. DUNLAP: You have obviously come to grips with a very difficult problem and you have thought about it. If people are not going to read, what is the future of the urban library? Would you suggest we turn them into motion picture houses or places where we have more TV sets? What would you envision as the way to go?

MR. SAKEY: For example, it has been my opinion for a long time -- many people have heard it -- that the best informational specialists we have in any city in this country are not people who work in libraries and are meeting the people's needs now. I am not talking about the price of butter or the Cost of Living Index or the Gross National Product; but the best people, the information people who have the information, the people's information in any city in this country are your city councilors. That is where people go to get information. That is where they go when they want to know how they can get into a hospital or how they can get into an aging home or, look, I have got a teen-age son. How do I find work for him? He doesn't come to the library for that kind of information.

We have four informational setups in the City of Boston. They are called Little City Halls, and that is where the people go for this kind of information. Yet it is information. It is people's information in my opinion that some of these libraries should give, but they don't, and I am saying that maybe informational referral systems is one way. I think another way is in at least using the building that you have and using the space that you have and using the people that you have instead of just having it sit there wastefully, you know, because it is a sleeper, because nobody knows that it is there. They may know it is there as a building, but they don't use it, but, you know, it is a kind of a sleeper. It is like in a horse race, people aren't aware that there are a hundred people working in the Cambridge Library or 5,000 people working in the Library of Congress or however many in Newark or these other cities, but the minute they begin to find out that $5 million and 10 million dollars are being spent in these libraries and they are not getting a piece of the action, I think we are in trouble.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Sakey, thank you very much. I am afraid we must move on now, but I do want to encourage you when you have had a chance to go over that

ERASABLE

draft program of ours, to write us at some length about your criticisms of it and your suggestions as to how to improve it.

MR. SAKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EndRS
Bg.TF
TF fls.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

Mr. Charles Crosby.

Mr. Crosby, would you tell us -- I haven't got a note here -- whom you represent?

MR. CROSBY: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am the coordinator of the Providence Public Library, the principal public library in the State of Rhode Island, and while I agree with some of Mr. Sakey's remarks, and while for three hours I have heard of our failures with adults, I would like to say that I do feel that in the state of Rhode Island, particularly in the city of Providence, we are succeeding with that segment of our society, the child, who is our one white hope and perhaps our best user to a rather appreciable and satisfactory degree.

This is not my area of concern as a coordinator, but I did want to speak supportively and perhaps even to reiterate my support for something for children services in the finely-articulated document that comes out of your draft. I am thinking of my own particular library and its work with children in almost over 5,000 separate functions or events with an attendance of better than 72,000, which is not too bad.

Now, I am not bragging that we failed in this area; there is much more that we should be doing, but I have been in this work since 1966 and I do not feel that we have failed.

We have, as librarians, a credibility in the social agencies of the state and the city of Providence, and in the circles of social concern a credibility we did not have at that time, because whether or not we have the money, we have at least consistently gone in with some youth, some enthusiasm, and given the thing a real try.

I think that the Commission should be urged to specify and articulate a position for work with children, and that is why I feel we need the continuance of the funding.

Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Before you go, could I ask you, how do you feel that Providence and the state library are dealing with the problem, the problem of the urban non-middle-class that are deprived and so forth?

MR. CROSBY: How do I feel?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes.

MR. CROSBY: I think that we are succeeding in that we go to meetings, we go out to the communities, belong to organizations; we know not just the president of the Human Relations Commission or of the dropout center, the Neighborhood Youth Corps or something, but we know people on the staff, people in the office, people at desks; we belong to the Urban League and we go to its meetings; we belong to the Opportunities Industrialization Center and we go to its meetings and we hear some of its graduates and some of its people. We have worked with the Latin-American community center.

Somebody was talking about documentation of minority groups. The Education Department of the State of Rhode Island does not know how many Portugese or how many Spanish have come into the state in the last two years, nevertheless the last month. The truancy department in the school system does not know anything about it either. We are a better check than their people.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

Mr. David Partington, Harvard University Library.

Mr. Partington, will you tell us what is your position with the library?

MR. PARTINGTON: I am the head of the Middle Eastern Division of the Harvard College Library and also am the chairman of the Library Committee of Middle East Studies Association and the chairman of the Middle Eastern Subdivision of the Foreign Acquisitions Subcommittee of the Association of Research Libraries.

When I learned of the existence of this Committee, I noticed that you were concerned with how one might better utilize the services of the Library of Congress, and I wish to speak on one very specific point.

For many years, the Library of Congress has been receiving card copy for books cataloged in various
T9 research libraries. That is, when we at Harvard or Michigan or some other library catalog a book we send one card from the card set to the Library of Congress. The cards for books written in Western languages appear in the National Union Catalog, which has been of inestimable value to libraries and scholars. The story is quite different for books written in the Middle Eastern languages, specifically Arabic and Persian.

For several decades certain research libraries have been sending card copy to the Library of Congress for each book cataloged in a Middle Eastern language. These cards have not been edited and published in either the National Union Catalog or in a separate catalog of Middle Eastern vernaculars. Those cards that we librarians send to

LC remain, so far as I know, unsorted in drawers, gathering dust. Thus, the many research libraries and the ever-growing number of Middle Eastern specialists in this country are deprived of the opportunity to take advantage of the cataloging work of other institutions.

What are the benefits that would accrue from a published catalog of these works? For the scholar at any college it would provide an immediate indication of where to find a book that is not in his own library. For the library it would provide the means to avoid the expenses and frustrations of trying to acquire an out-of-print book from Middle Eastern suppliers: in effect, it would provide for the sharing of resources that already exist. For the librarian, it would provide a bibliographic tool for ascertaining entries, editions, and other technical information.

For several decades, major American research collections have been engaged in a competitive struggle to build their own resources for Middle Eastern research. The time has come, due to the decrease in private and federal funding for area studies, the devaluation of the dollar, the inflation of book prices abroad, when simple economics is forcing upon us the necessity to cooperate. A very important step in the right direction would be to assure the publication of a union catalog of Middle Eastern vernaculars by the Library of Congress.

CHM. BURKHARDT: John, do you have any words of solace for Mr. Partington?

MR. LORENZ: I will certainly take the message back to the Library of Congress, but I would be interested in knowing now --

MR. PARTINGTON: They have the message already.

MR. LORENZ: What have they said to you in response?

MR. PARTINGTON: Year after year requests have gone in, I am told, from Orientalia for different positions to sort out the cards, but there is always some priority.

MR. AINES: Just one brief comment. If you could find one way to yoke the collections with oil, perhaps you will have some success.

MR. PARTINGTON: We have our hopes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Reverend Hal Meyers. Is he here?

MR. MEYERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I have worked with the New Jersey Department of Education in my work, and since being transferred to Western Massachusetts, to Lenox, I have been involved with the Western Massachusetts Regional Library Center in Pittsfield, and I am here to make a plea for a move away from a multiplicity of fixed-based operations. I feel that in a rural area a regional center, which would work in close coordination with the series of bookmobiles, would meet the needs of an ever-increasing number of people who are deprived of the opportunity of making themselves available of the traditional library setting.

Particularly we find that there is an increasing number of nursing homes in which the people are still mentally active and these are oftentimes people who have had a professional life, people who had been library users in the past, but find that now, since they are confined to a nursing home, they are cut off from any kind of individual meaningful contact with the outside world.

A bookmobile coming to a nursing home provides this kind of contact.

I find that when people are cut off from their normal contacts, many of these people suffer mental depressions which often lead to aggravating their physical ailments. In addition, in smaller towns the professional people who are there -- the clergy, the physicians, the attorneys and so forth -- do not have access to current materials because there is no library or the library is too small to really have an adequate supply of specialized materials.

Now, they do not get it on interlibrary loan, but oftentimes this takes a great deal of time. We find that we have to depend on the bookmobile.

The community that I am in, for instance, has no library; we depend on the bookmobile and the personnel to mail stuff to us. They will even make extra trips that are unauthorized in order to see that we get stuff that is needed in a hurry.

I would like to reiterate or support the lady's statement from Maine who talked about medical libraries. All we have in our community are large numbers of interns and residents who are not American citizens, and the library -- the general reading material, when they use the library, they are improving their knowledge of English and this improves their ability to take case histories into consideration and to be better physicians to people in the community. So this is an important concept.

I think that the bookmobile does something else. The bookmobile is oftentimes the first step to motivate the people to seek out regular organized library services in a traditional sense, but if this is their first contact with the library and if this is unsatisfactory, there is no motivation for them to make an effort to go to a public library any place in the city.

I believe that the Commission should sponsor and encourage research into the development of mobile libraries that will have microfilm storage, retrieval systems and the kind of electronic devices that would enable them to provide for rural America the kind of library services that are found in the large cities.

I think that the rural Americans are entitled to this and the migrant workers are entitled to this because I think it is a tragedy to waste a mind wherever that mind may be found. Thank you very much.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Stevens has a question.

MR. STEVENS: I would like to be sure that I understood what you said. The ordinary bookmobile carries something on the order of 3,000 to 10,000 volumes as kind of a maximum.

REVEREND MEYERS: Yes. It is a 3509-type vehicle.

MR. STEVENS: Yes. If one converted a substantial volume of that stock to microfilm format, and provided users with getting at some microform format material, you are suggesting it would be possible to have availability to one hundred to two hundred thousand volumes or more?

REVEREND MEYERS: Yes.

MR. STEVENS: Of information on a local basis temporarily, as long as that bookmobile was located in a specific location, and that users in your view could be taught to manipulate microform readers, they would eventually want them and gain access to wide varieties of materials through traveling bookmobiles rather than access to narrow collections of materials through bookmobiles. Is that correct?

REVEREND MEYERS: Yes, Mr. Stevens, and I also think that if this material were available in the bookmobile,it would provide a stimulation for the users at a later time to seek out a public library in town which might some miles away and also it would provide him with additional library skills.

I heard earlier a speaker comment about the fact that people were not educated to library skills, and this would certainly give them some basic skills prior to entering the front door of our traditional library.

I would also like to point out that with a building, it is in one place, you have high maintenance costs and it is a static situation; where, with the bookmobile, you have your investment in the machine itself, the truck itself, but it is a minimal investment and it serves a wide area and also a large number of patrons.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

REVEREND MEYERS: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Foster Palmer. Would you identify yourself, Mr. Palmer?

MR. PALMER: Yes. I am Associate University Librarian at Harvard University.

For the past seveal years, I have been working with the application of computers to libraries. However, I am going to disappoint anyone who thinks I may have found the philosopher's stone in this area and go back to an earlier time when I was in charge of public services in the Widener Libary, which is the central library at Harvard. My comments are really addressed to two caveats in the area of making the resources of large libraries available more widely to the public.

I think in the large libraries we feel a great sense of responsibility to make our resources available to a wider public than our own local clientele, but I have observed two areas where I think there has to be some caution, and in any networks that you propose that involve reciprocal use of libraries or use of academic libraries by the public, I want to call attention to a phenomenon, and perhaps I should read this since it is probably more succintly put than I would be able to do ex tempore.

Perhaps something of a paradox exists that at least is not necessarily what would be expected by the layman. There tends to be a direct rather than an inverse relationship between the rarity or unusual quality of library holdings and the willingness of the owning library to share them with all the world. Rare book libraries are customarily opened to scholars without regard to institutional affiliation. Of course, the rare book material requires special protection, but this protection is given impartially. It applies to local users as well as visitors.

Requests for user of scarce or unusual materials in the general collections that are not in the rare book collections -- and there is a very large area in large library; and this is perhaps the largest part of most large libraries -- consisting of what I would call scarce books. They are not rare books in special rare book libraries, but they are uncommon, unusual and scarce books. This is the difference between the small and middle-sized libraries and large libraries.

The large libraries have large numbers of unusual, scarce though not rare, books. Requests for use of those scarce materials in the general collections by people who are not members of the institution either using them on the spot or by means of interlibrary loan are generally dealt with very sympathetically. Certainly there are problems in this area.

The whole financial basis of interlibrary loan is under study, but in general I think you will find the large libraries really are glad to make their resources available to other people; they do not hoard them for themselves. Where larger libraries do draw the line and become very protective against the use by persons outside their regular clientele is likely to be when the visitors want common materials which are already in competition between the library's primary circle -- in most cases these books would be available to visitors in their own libraries, but there is a practical problem here, that in deciding which library to go to on a particular day, on a particular occasion, a person quite naturally prefers the library that has all the books. Then when he gets there, he doesn't limit his use as a visitor to the uncommon books but he competes with the local people, the students and so on, for the latest book by J. K. Galbraith, or whatever it may be.

So they may have been given permission to use the large library possibly in some general cooperative scheme worked out under the auspices of a body such as yours, on the basis for their need for its unusual resources.

But then when they get there, they compete with everyone else for the common books.

Now, I don't have any particular solution here, but I think it is something that should be kept in mind as perhaps any cooperative agreements or agreements for cooperative use are being made, and I think that much of the resistance to such agreements might fade away if this particular problem is addressed.

Now turning from the use by actual visitors, I would also like to make a caveat in the general area of microfilm. To the extent that a national network might lead to greatly increased sending about of original copies of scarce though not rare books, I am very concerned about the problem of book wear. Now, certainly an alternative to sending books around is microfilm, and I think here specifically I would hope that any program of microfilming in lieu of loan would be coordinated with programs of microfilming for preservation.

There is a great problem, as I hope you are aware of, because of poor paper books. Most books, ever since the introduction of our wood pulp and other non-rare papers a century or a century and a quarter ago, there has been a severe problem of deterioration. This isn't helped by the fact that most American libraries are overloaded and very dry in the winter. So we do need to conserve our original books, and there are proposals for microfilming for preservation, and I can see where there might be a great deal of microfilming for purposes of library networks, and I would like to see these two types of microfilming coordinated.

Now, certainly it would cost somewhat more to microfilm a book for a preservation program that is up to archival standards than it would be merely to provide an observation copy which might be considered more or less a throwaway. But my opinion is that in any such program of providing copies that one consider the labor of page turning, which is a very large factor in microfilming, but the wear and tear on the books -- and I would hope that the fairly modest cost of processing to archival standards could be absorbed rather than making throwaway copies at a slightly lesser cost.

Now, those are rather specialized points perhaps, but they did occur from my experience in the public service area and that might be relevant to a program such as your Commission might sponsor.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

Any questions? Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: Foster, from your experience, dealing with the computer side of your background, and maybe this is an unfair question: Could you tick off the one, two or three major obstacles,national obstacles, that exist at the present time to computer progress in the library world?

MR. PALMER: Well, I did in my remarks here say that I think economics is more of a limitation than technology. There are many, many things that can be done demonstrably, but they cannot be funded or afforded. Well, I was speaking here of the use. I spoke of people going to the libraries, I spoke of microfilm. I didn't even speak of putting the text into machine-readable form. This is a very exciting possibility, but in my view it is as yet wildly uneconomic except in some very specialized areas.

Now, I think something will be done in the medical area before they are done at the general area. For instance, the urgency is greater in medicine, the funding is better in medicine. The areas with which I have been personally concerned -- such fields, let us say, as history -- they are going to be one of the last areas where such things as full text machinery will be available because it is so voluminous and you are not dealing with the larger quantity of new matter as you do with science and medicine, but you are dealing with retrospective material and it has not drawn general support as medicine and science have.

MR. LORENZ: You are not questioning the bibliographic machinery though?

MR. PALMER: No. I think the bibliographic machinery is here, but I think the full text in machinery form -- I say the economics for that is very discouraging at the present time.

MR. LORENZ: How about abstracting as an in-between step?

MR. PALMER: Well, I think there is more obtainable, but I think it will come first on a current basis in science and in medicine, where the relative importance of current and future material is greater. In other words, if you start putting abstracts in machinery-readable form now, in five years in science you have got something. If you start doing this in history now, in five years you don't have much.

MR. LORENZ: How do you assess the results of the INTREX project at MIT?

MR. PALMER: Well, I think this is a -- you know, it is a tremendously interesting demonstration, but I think the scale on which it was done, the size of the library and the costs bear out what I say, that this will, to the extent that this is done, be done first on a fairly small scale in rather narrow areas where the material is concentrated in time and in volume and the support is good. And I do not look to this as a really practical thing in such fields as history and so on in the near future.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: Do you see any hope for COM?

MR. PALMER: Well, yes, I think once you get over the hurdle of getting the material into the machine-readable form, I think COM might be a very great saving over paper copies, you know. But I think your big hurdle is getting the material into machine-readable form.

Now, in these remarks I did say something about capturing publishers'or printers' tapes. As you probably know, most books now are in the printing process going into machine-readable form and at the present time it is very difficult to make further use of this material in most cases because of various technical factors, but I do think that maybe there might be some standards, efforts here and possibly some developments of a repository for material from publishers into machine-readable form.

Then, of course, this leads up to another very thorny topic, and that is copyright, and I am no expert on that, but that is one way in which this large body of machine-readable form might come about over a period of years, by input from machine-readable data in the publishing process.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much.

This concludes the public part of the program, and I want to congratulate those of you who spoke in keeping your remarks brief. We actually have got two and a half minutes left of the time.

I wondered -- we have a Mrs. Tashjian here, and there have been several references to the needs of children. And I understand you are a really great authority on this subject. I wonder if you would like to take a few minutes to tell us what you think and what we might do.

MRS. TASHJIAN: Well, I am really not an authority. I am authority perhaps on working with children in storytelling and folklore, but really, may I say one other thing, sir: Not that children are not important, they are the most important thing, but I have been much concerned about the fact that we are an information center and yet it is so difficult for us as public libraries -- and I speak now as a public librarian -- to impart that information to the public. It is so costly --

CHM. BURKHARDT: You are in the public library of Newton, Mass?

MRS. TASHJIAN: Yes. I wonder if this Commission ought not to make some effort to do something about making it easier for us and cheaper for us via postage. If it is possible for some of our legislators to send out information free of charge, and 80 percent of it is political, why is it not possible for us to use that same privilege? Our postage is phenomenal, and yet we are an information center.

I would ask that this Commission do something to help us in that area. Well, that does have something to do with children. There is a great deal of our information which goes out to children. Yes, I think the area of children is slighted in this report and I am terribly sorry about that, because over 50 percent really of most public libraries work within the field of children and, through them, their parents.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, you must not be too concerned because this is a preliminary draft.

MRS. TASHJIAN: Yes, I hope so.

CHM. BURKHARDT: And we have plenty of time for us to change it. This is one of the benefits of this type of hearing, to subject it to public scrutiny. We want to get this kind of input and criticism.

MRS. TASHJIAN: I hope when you ask for input -- I am not going to make any -- I hope your school libraries and the school librarians and public librarians and, above all, those who teach children's librarians, the educators in the children's field, do get together and give you some input. This is very important. We seem to slight them and they seem to have a lot of influence on children. I am really not prepared to make any other statement.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mrs. Tashjian.

Mr. McNiff, of the Boston Public Libraries, is in the audience. Would you like to say a word or two to us while we have a little opportunity?

MR. McNIFF: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have been here all morning, so you must have a good notion of the scope and complexity of the problems that confront us all.

MR. McNIFF: I have been very much interested in the various remarks that have been made, and also with the draft proposal which you have for networks.

Mr. Canham, one of our former trustees, is going to be speaking to the group and I don't want to perhaps impinge on anything he might be saying to you, but the question of the role of the metropolitan library did come up earlier.

I think we need to have concern for the role of the metropolitan library in any network that is devised. I think the programs must start at the grass roots in the local communities, because it is here in the local communities where you can identify the various problems in regard to the disadvantaged, whether educationally, ethnic or whatever the level of the disadvantaged state that the people are in. I think we need to have a total program of resource development, and this is one of the things that has not come today, when talking about the role of libraries.

We heard about the rural libraries and we hear about the services in our neighboring states to the north, in Maine and Vermont and New Hampshire, and I think one of the things that the Commission should address itself to is the federally-financing resource in each state or region of the country so that that resource would be immediately available and accessible to the people in the state.

I think it unrealistic to think in terms of depending upon a central library in the United States as a central lending library. I think our programs need to be divided perhaps into three categories: the need for bibliographic information; and here I would strongly support and urge the Commission to back the Library of Congress program for getting full funding for the impact program because this is not only of value to the research libraries or the large metropolitan libraries, but I think these services can be filtered down into the smaller libraries by network operations.

I think the second point is the need for regional resource lending centers which will upgrade the accessibility of resources to people for whatever purpose they need them.

The third area is in the field of reference and research resources, and I think we cannot depend on our private institutions or universities or our specialized libraries for this service because these are not always as successful as one would like.

Mr. Palmer pointed out some of the problems that are inherent in trying to develop greater access to the large university library collections, but when one considers that the normal life span of a person in the business, professional world where he needs access to information is a much longer period of time than when he is in the formal education period of his life, that this is where the metropolitan library or the regional-state resource centers can play a vitally important part.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thanks very much, Mr. McNiff.

Has Mr. Canham arrived yet? If not, I would like to call on Ms. Arlene Hope, of the U. S. Office of Education in the Boston area.

I would also like to ask Mrs. Moore to take the chair in my absence.

MS. HOPE: It is a great pleasure for me to be here and have the opportunity to talk with the Commission. I did indicate that perhaps they didn't need me today because we would rather hear it from the general public, but I was asked to speak with you.

First I would like to give you my comments on the draft proposal, and since I have written out a little summary of these remarks, I can do it quite quickly.

I would like to say that I think the idea of a national network is not a new one, but because we have been talking about this for,lo, these many years, but what is new about this proposal in my idea is that for the first time an official national body is coming out with a strong statement in support of the national network. I am approving of this, of course, because I had it as part of my recommendation in my prepared testimony.

I would like to comment on several specific points which I think that other people have already drawn out. It is apparent in the draft that the concern had to be spent mostly on the federal role and the state role, but we have all heard already that there is a real omission in the paper thus far of the strong role that the city library should take and the involvement in the medium-sized and the small-sized libraries.

Also, the academic libraries and the school libraries need to have their inputs, too.

Now, in my testimony I assumed that a national network could become a reality because of the technology which is already in existence. I use the FTS system every day and I know that there is a national communications network. I know that there are computerized programs that are easily used; so in my testimony I accept the fact that a network can become a reality. Therefore, I would like to point out two things that I think have to be a reality before the network can become very useful.

One of these things is the immense effort that must be taken by the Commission, by all the libraries and the immense amount of money that I think it will take to tell the public about this program.

It has long been my feeling that we have not changed the image of the library because we have not told the public what we have and what we can do. Even at this minimal stage of our library career, when we are not really networking all over the country.

You heard Ralph Nader say in that famous meeting at the midwinter that we need the Madison Avenue techniques, and I believe this. I think we ought to have as a parallel in this famous network a little subliminal line that keeps saying to every person, "Go to the library, go to the library, go to the library."

I think if you don't instill this into the general public, into every citizen, you are not going to have the use of the network by the general public.

I did indicate in my testimony that I believe the scholar does not have to be urged to use the library. You heard that this morning very thoroughly from the professor from Bennington College.

The other point that I would like to make very strongly is the fact that a network assumes that every librarian in the country is not only sold on the idea of a network but is ready, willing and able to use it, and this is not so. Many librarians are even afraid to use a telephone; they will not use the telephone to call up for an interlibrary loan; and you will have to train the librarians in the use of the network.

A good example of this occurred when I was working out in California, and you may remember and may have read the description of the San Joaquin Valley Library System, the information network that was set up there. I was there at the time, and we set up this beautiful network in the San Joaquin Valley and then nobody used it, nobody used it from the public, and then the librarians did not use it. So one of the efforts that had to be put in right away was the fact that a bonus sort of program was put in for each librarian to see how many times she could use the telephone in one week. It really was true that they were so unused to the idea that they could pick up a phone and call in and say, "Can you help me get this information?" that they just didn't do it. So there was an immense training program even on that little level to get librarians to use the network services that had been set up for them.

So I think those two points -- that the network must indoctrinate the public and that the network must indoctrinate staff -- have to be addressed before the network itself will either be utilized to any practical extent or whether it will be used at all.

Now do you have any questions on what I had in my testimony?

MRS. MOORE: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: Do you really think that the public can be "Madison-Avenued" into a library?

MS. HOPE: I think that the public, a greater number of the public can be "Madison-Avenued" in.

MR. AINES: I think that is the first time we have used it as a verb.

MS. HOPE: Well, you heard Mr. Sakey say that 80 percent of the people don't use the library, but I think a lot of these people will use a library if they are told what the library is and what it has.

Now, I may be confronted with the idea that once they get there they don't find what they want because the library is not adequate, and I have to grant you that, too. But how many people do you know that just say, Oh, they never use the library and this being so, if they do not get "Madison-Avenued" into the library, they will find something that they want or if the network is operating properly, the librarian will say,"I don't have it here, but I will try to get it for you."

MS. MOORE: Any other questions?

MS. WU: I would like to know the structure of your office. Just from your title I know you are the Librarian Services Program Officer in Region 1. Are there other people working with you?

MS. HOPE: Mrs. Wu was asking what my position is and how I fit into the structure. In a nutshell, I am part of the Office of Education, HEW. I am the Regional Program Officer for the six New England states, which is Region 1, and there are ten regions in the country, each of which has a regional program officer like myself. We carry out the Library Services and Construction Act Program in an administrative and what we call providing technological or technical assistance, and we also have involvement in the other programs of the higher education act.

The program officers in the region are not at this point in elementary and secondary education. This is still operated directly from the office in Washington.

MS. MOORE: John?

T10 MR. LORENZ: From your personal, professional librarian point of view and as a regional coordinator for this area, do you feel the libraries are ready for a more generalized approach to federal assistance for libraries, or do you feel the categorical grants should continue?

MS. HOPE: I think you heard from a number of people this morning their plea for categorical grants to be continued. I think I have to support that right now because our work is not done. We have not gotten beyond the need for local support being concentrated purely within the local area, and I think that the best use of the federal funds that we have had in terms of reaching the national priorities that we have set is the fact that we have this little extra bit of money devoted strictly to the library which it can use to try out something new and different, which has not been able to have been tried out before, either within a library such as the Homesmobile that Mr. McNiff has been operating or within the state area, such as the programming you heard about from Mr. DeBuse, or the interstate program such as you heard about in the document center and other interstate activities that we are just starting up. So I feel right now that we should not stop a categorical grant program to libraries. Ultimately, if there were enough money at the local level and at the state level to carry on the basic program, I this might be the time for the federal government to expand into this upper network and to pick up those special innovative programs that are so necessary but that the individual community or the individual state just does not feel it will ever have enough money to stretch out to.

MS. MOORE: I will let Mr. Becker go next.

MR. BECKER: Arlene, I would like to get back to Madison Avenue.

MS. HOPE: Okay.

MR.BECKER: I see a contradiction and would appreciate your comment on it.

While at the same time we may be trying to bring more people into the library, it seems to me we are continuing to erect barriers to service -- "we" meaning librarians in some cases, because we are unsure that we can handle the work load. It is that kind of attitude. So we are not very aggressive about going out to find new customers. That is a contradiction.

MS. HOPE: Yes, it is.

MR. BECKER: How do you read it?

MS. HOPE: I can feel the tightening up of the muscles when you hear or when you tell a librarian or suggest to a librarian that it is time to go out for a big publicity campaign, for this very reason: that she will say or he will say, "We are doing absolutely everything we can right now. We cannot stretch ourselves another inch," and we all know that librarians do try to stretch themselves beyond a normal capacity to perform.

I think the only thing is that at the same time as I am urging a massive campaign to get the public to come into the library, I also have to urge a massive campaign to get more funds to provide more staff, to provide better programs, you know, the jack, "the house that jack built." It just has to be both things at once or I doubt if it will work.

MR.STEVENS: Arlene, is there any changing pattern in the willingness of special libraries in the New England area to assist other libraries in forming networks and providing their specialized resources through the public libraries or through school libraries to people who need the resources of special libraries?

MS. HOPE: That is a nice question and I think the answer is yes. You heard again from Mr. DeBuse this morning how the Antiquarian Society and the Worcester Foundation and the other -- there was a third special library in that group which I cannot think of right now -- oh, the Art Institute: You heard how they are willing participants in this cooperative.

Now, I was in that area as a regional director for a short time and I knew about those libraries and I think if I had an opportunity to ask for an interlibrary loan, I might have received one, but I had no concept at that time of the way it was at that time compared to the way it is now.

They are full participants in such a consortium.

Also, we have a very good evidence in the fact that you are going to hear from a special librarian very shortly, Mr. Huleatt and the Special Libraries Chapter in Boston and in the various states of New England who are participating in it as members of the panel of councillors in this new library board activity that we are doing, so the special librarians are entering into the field of total library service that we are promoting here in New England.

MS. MOORE: Thank you very much, Ms. Hope, for your testimony. We appreciate your coming.

Our next witness is Mr. Erwin Canham. Mr. Canham needs no introduction certainly to a Boston audience, but I would just like to state, as you all know, he is editor-in-chief of the Christian Science Monitor and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and trustee of the Boston Public Library, three very important groups of people for whom he speaks. The chair would like to remind Mr. Canham that she served with him on a board about 20 years ago and I haven't seen him since and I would like to say that you must have discovered the Fountain of Youth.

MR. CANHAM: Madam, you are much too kind.

I would like to say that I return the compliment. It was an interesting experience.

I shall try not to bore you with reminiscences of my life with libraries. But I have been more or less intimately connected with libraries from my college undergraduate days to the present, when,as your chairman has kindly said, I am just rounding out three terms as a Trustee of the Boston Public Library. There was a time when I was a freshman in college that I was paid for working in the public library. I got a dollar a night, three hours' work, trying to maintain order in the high school reference library in Auburn, Maine; and this seemed to me to be lavish beyond the dreams of avarice, and I was very grateful for it ever since as a link between my private life and my professional and the resources of libraries has been a very genuine and important one. But I am not interested in reminiscences and I am sure you are much less interested in them.

I am very much more interested in the future, and especially in what this Commission is seeking to work out. As you know, and as others have told you far better than I can, here in Massachusetts we have worked out a regional library system which, from the layman's point of view, from the trustees' point of view, an admirable start seems to have been made in making available to all communities in the Commonwealth the best in library resources. I have no doubt that this kind of regional system, like others, will be helpful to you as you make the quantum leap toward a national system. And I daresay that there are so many differences between what can be done at the scale of the region and what will have to be done nationally.

We are all very poignantly aware and disturbingly aware of perhaps the fantastic growth rate of knowledge. Whether it be that scientific knowledge doubles every 15 years, as some have calculated, or at a somewhat lower rate--say once every 25 years -- there is no doubt that since the days of Isaac Newton the growth of knowledge has been very, very cumulative. No doubt you are more familiar than I with Fremont Rider's calculation that if the output of books continues to grow as it has from the middle of the 19th century to the middle of the 20th, the Yale University Library would in 2040 have about 200 million volumes occupying 6,000 miles of shelves, coming in at the rate of 12 million volumes a year.

This is one of the many exponential rates at which so many things which are examples of growth in our system have developed and, of course, I think this, as well as some other things, will have to flatten out before they reach the point of absurdity -- flatten out something like the curves called by the mathematicians the sigmoid. I love the word "sigmoid" and use it with relish. It is a kind of "S," and as the curve goes up and then begins to flatten out, I should suppose quite a number of our growth curves will have to assume a more moderate pace before we destroy ourselves and our society.

I am not preaching a no-growth society doctrine at all but am trying to approach realistically that the notion of exponential growth in many things, including growth in many kinds of publications and so on, is still under the influence of perhaps natural conditions and will begin to moderate. Already though, whether it does or not, and particularly in those respects in which has not, surely we face very acutely the problem of information glut.

I do not suggest, of course, that we know all there is to know about everything -- far from it -- as some respectable scientists in the 19th century believed we did. Of course, they were wrong. Some people as late as the 1930's were making some such statements. I am sure we will go on discovering some very important things, go on building up the stockpile of knowledge, but I hope, as I say, the rate of discovery will calm down somehow.

The problem you are tackling, which is directly related, of course, to the handling of the stockpile of knowledge, is not only the assimilation and the storing of new information but of facilitating access to it and distribution of what we already know, let alone of what we may be adding to our stockpile as time goes on, and this is thus your task, which of course is of primordial importance.

All of us who want and need access to information should eagerly support what you are striving to do. You can help us escape, I think, from the frustration and the confusion and, indeed, perhaps the turbulence which can result from information glut. So I place great importance not only on the storage of information but on its codifying and, of course, other distribution. More power to you. You can help us to save us from drowning in a sea of information. You can teach us to swim and navigate. Perhaps the best way to say it is that you are building the boats which will keep us afloat as we are engulfed by the floods of knowledge.

May I now descend from what may be the grandiose to the mundane, and I hope to be quite practical, and as I do, let me confess to a conflict of interest. If you want to stop me, please do so. I will be prepared to stop if you want me to, but I happen to be involved personally in the development of a major system of national data transmission. I am a member of the Board of Directors of a company known as DATRAN, Inc. This is a company being rapidly built up into a national network for data transmission. By the end of this year we will be transmitting data over the first link of the system, in Texas, and then soon will extend it to the major centers of the nation.

Ours is a digital switched system. The computer speaks to computer in digital language, which means that it will transmit information much faster, much cheaper and much more accurately than existing systems. Anything that can be put in a digital mode --and I think that can be applied to all information just as in existing facsimile transmission -- can go over this network.

Using existing networks of analog form, 2,000 to 4,000 bits per second can be transmitted. By the Datran digital system, 1.3 million bits per second can be transmitted, and that is a very major difference.

Therefore, I suggest, with due respect, that before you commit yourselves to recommending the necessity of a new network, possibly a governmentally financed data transmission network, you look further into what will soon be available in a privately financed commercial system.

I shall make so bold as to suggest that suitable executives of the corporation on which I serve get in touch with your Washington office, to provide any information you may need from them in making your own evaluation of the situation, of the system and of the technology of data transmission, which is so radically changing.

As I say, I hope I am not out of order in this brief reference, for I believe that the transmission system by which you join the centers of knowledge is of very great importance to the economics and effectiveness of the plans that you are developing. I conclude by reiterating my conviction that you are working in a crucial area. Knowledge has been called our "strategy resource." The future of our society depends on its wise use.

At the very end let me perhaps touch a slightly facetious note and let me point out that as a citizen of Boston, as a New Englander, one is singularly unselfish in applauding your efforts. The availability of knowledge, not only in libraries but elsewhere in the great educational institutions of this part of the world, has saved us from economic decline. With the departure of the textile industry, New England was severely hit. During and after the second World War, the growth of knowledge at MIT, at Harvard and elsewhere began to spin off into new laboratories, new companies, new manufacturing plants, new researches, until it produced the magic crescent of Route 128 and we were saved.

Now, in supporting you in generalizing much of this knowledge to all the rest of the country, we are carrying altruism pretty far. Of course, we could not bottle it up, even if we tried. Knowledge migrates. Ideas spread, even without electronic aid. Sometimes I think even ideas spread better by the tom-tom and the underground than by microwave systems. Sometimes that is the way it works, but there is no reason that we should not participate in the sharing of knowledge efficiently.

I am sure that your report, your recommendations, will be a major contribution to the well-being of our national society.

Thank you.

MS. MOORE: All right, thank you, Mr. Canham.

Any questions?

MR. AINES: As an old-time reader of your paper -- and I will go back to that side of your discussion -- I certainly appreciate your words.

Very recently a study was made by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris. I am sure you are familiar with that, too.

MR. CANHAM: Yes.

MR. AINES: A study was made by an economist from Paris -- the Sorbonne is his stamping ground. He was asked to look at the number of people that would be involved in the information processing, broadly speaking, for the companies involved in OECD to make predictions and to create national policies, if you will, that will respond with the requisite kind of educational and training systems.

He decided that in order to do this he would have to have a better fix on the quantity of information being developed. Since you mention this, I might tell you that his findings are very momentous because that logistic curve that you talked about, which there is another name for, some people believe have reached the outer limits and he denies it vehemently and has indicated that by the year 1985 there will be a 34 to 74 percent increase of knowledge, which makes it much more than the doubling factor that was mentioned, if this is correct. With this representation on the total community represented here and the knowledge in the community of the United States, there will have to be some serious engineering and reengineering undertaken in our knowledge-handling activities.

I mention this because I think the message of what this gentleman has found ought to be gotten into the press somehow. It would be the strongest ally we have in the library information world if people understood that we are not necessarily just trying to improve the health of our libraries or are worrying about our economic futures. We have a real problem ahead, and these projections show what that problem is.

MR. CANHAM: I had hoped I would get some good ideas by coming here and already one is forthcoming. I have just been reading the chapters on this subject in Daniel Bell's current book, "The Future of the Post-Industrial Society," and it is he that talks with some reserve about the possibility of a sigmoid curve in the growth of knowledge, and quite possibly it could be that the distinguished scholar in Paris is right. But I have also been involved in other recent researches in, as I say, how to avoid being completely overwhelmed, being able to handle and cope with this.

Some people think that the knowledge tide will produce, as I said, turbulence. In the ability to cope, we all know that the capacity to make decisions is sometimes caused by knowing too little and it is sometimes inhibited by knowing too little and sometimes inhibited by knowing too much, and this is one of the dangers, I think, and so insofar as the kind of system you are thinking about, if it can somehow aid in the codifying as well as in the transmitting of information, you will surely be making a direct contribution to this very serious problem.

I don't know. From where I sit, obviously I don't see how any of us can be any too confident about the rate at which the growth of knowledge is going to continue, but in my bones I would think that your savant in Paris is more nearly likely to be right than those who expect it to flatten out, and yet is it not true that surely something cannot go on forever in many areas of human life, including the population and everything else and, therefore, why should we not expect somehow some kind of moderation in the knowledge curve as well as others? I don't know.

MR. AINES: Let me point out that it is not necessarily true. It is only new knowledge that creates this continued exponential curve, compounding the effect, but as we are moving into the data world, where transmission, the handling, is within the computers, where miles of magnetic tape are involved and storing up of bits of information, we are creating a new situation which this world has never seen.

The explosion of data, we feel,will follow the explosion of literature, and I don't believe there is a school in the country today that is preparing experts who will be handling data in that mode.

We have asked, for example, in the past how many people are trained to handle the information processes in the quest for environmental quality. There are no universities that are training people for this type of thing. They must come from all other kinds of fields: engineering, science, library. But for the great needs that we are beginning to find in information areas, there is no practical, no academic schooling provided. Everything now is practical and we don't know whether in the long run this is the best way to go. This is starting to become the major way of creating knowledge in the future, so you can see the difficulty we will have because there will be literally many, many miles of tape that will accumulate in great new future libraries.

So the point then of the fact is that we are in a sort of period of preparation, and I hope I will be able to encourage your own writing in these matters.

MR. CANHAM: Yes, and I gain hope in the fact that we have learned to miniaturize and I hope we have learned something about how to codify as well as miniaturize and classify.

MS. MOORE: Mr. Cuadra.

MR. CUADRA: I am glad you relieved us of any guilt in our demand for more training and I am glad you did. I think it is important to have competition of the sort that Datran and others are providing to drive the costs of communications down.

I have one question. You sell information, in effect, and I think, more than many organizations you treat it as a commodity rather than, say, as a resource. I wonder if you see any kind of dividing line between things that ought to be provided free to the public and things that ought to be paid for.

MR. CANHAM: Well, surely there is not anything that is really provided free. It is whether or not you pay for it in an apparently concealed way. I wonder if perhaps you would tell me whether I am missing the understanding of the question. If you are talking about, say, the flow of news and the description of events in the world, information about events, news, and if the idea is that this should be a public service, I think that this presents considerable difficulty.

(a) We want and have not got as much competition as we would like and

(b) if it is to be paid for out of taxes, this raises the question of who controls it -- a grave matter.

So I would think my answer is that I would like to have everything that we receive identifiable in terms as to how we are paying for it instead of thinking that we get it free. I would rather have us know that we are paying for something. Thinking that when we listen to the radio or watch the television it is free, we disabuse ourselves of this and realize that we are paying for it in the toothpaste and some of the other less admirable things that are advertised on television.

So, no, I guess I would say as much as possible I would like to have the price tag on everything we get and pay for it directly, rather than indirectly, to the fullest possible degree.

MR. LORENZ: At the other end of the information scale, Mr. Canham, we earlier today heard a very discouraging picture from the City of Cambridge, where it was reported that 80 to 90 percent of the people of Cambridge had either cut themselves off from library access or were cut off from library access. As a trustee of the Boston Public Library, would you comment on the relative emphasis that should be given to this problem versus the problem of getting access to the libraries for the more sophisticated user?

MR. CANHAM: I regard this as an absolutely vital and primary problem. I don't know whether Mr. McNiff told you about usage of the Boston Public Library and its branch library system. If he did not, I hope he did, because I believe that business is quite good and that there is quite an extensive and, I think, a growing degree of utilization.

Now, why there should be a difference between this and Cambridge, I do not know. Therefore, I could not answer, but I share the feeling that this is the ultimate test: how much of the rich value of the library is reaching people and is thus having something to do with the values in their lives.

I would say, for example, there is no point in writing anything unless someone will read it and there is no point having it in the library unless somehow or other it enters into the life of someone and does something for them, even if it is just entertainment, which is an important part of life. So I think it is an important problem to which the utmost attention should be given.

I listened intently to the previous witness, who was talking about the promotional support of libraries, and the phrase "Madison Avenue" is of course a condemning sort of phrase and I would not use it, but at the same time I do not think that there is anything wrong in libraries seeking whatever ways they find compatible with their role in striving explicitly to reach the community and in promoting their services. For indeed, we have to promote practically everything else, and there are legitimate ways of doing this, as well as good ways and vulgar ways, and we have to find the right way to go about it.

But I agree that the problem with making sure people use libraries is just as important, and perhaps most important, in all of the range of topics that you are contemplating.

MS. MOORE: Any other questions?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Canham, may I follow up on your comments regarding paying for services. The daily newspaper, with its conveyance of news, is paid for by subscriptions and advertising, at least in part. The New York Times is now finding that its past record is also a commodity. That is, the information of another record is still viable. I know that Mr. Singer and Mr. Finglund in your organization have collected materials and have now put them in microform and made them available as a question-and-answer service freely in the community here in New England, and I wonder if you can foresee that information source at the Monitor and other newspapers becoming a kind of retrospective well of information that is either free or available at a charge? Have you thought at all about that in terms of future development?

MR. CANHAM: Yes, by all means, I think that there are the two approaches you suggest. One, this could be developed as a kind of utility, as a kind of service for operations which need that kind of professional information. In other words, in a regional or local newspaper one would no longer have to seek to maintain all the range of activities of its reference library necessarily but could tie into a network, which the Times, I believe, has gone and done quite a lot to try to set up. I think we would all be very much interested in cooperating in such a system, and I would not be surprised if it will be here one of these days as a sharing, not only for information media themselves but, as you suggest, in whatever ways are feasible and useful for the public.

I have spoken of promotion. This might be a very good way for a group to promote itself. I think we are making emphasis on its service to the community by adding this kind of service to the regular printed word. I may add that I think in the next period of time, maybe not in this decade but a little farther on, I would expect the whole process by which news and related information, the normal newspaper content, is communicated to people, will change very drastically and take an entirely different form. It may well be through the cable television and the printout; it may well be that it is at your console at home, where you dial up a package of information about business, a package T11 about sports, a package about shopping and commercial packages, a package about national, a package about international and so on. This may well happen. These things are technically possible, as you know; the question of who is going to finance them, the question which Mr. Cuadra asked about, what is free and who pays, is, I think, very relative to this whole range of change. A good deal of what a newspaper provides, as we all know, is a sort of invisible thing because while the advertising is not invisible, oftentimes people don't realize that what they pay for the paper is usually less than half of what it costs to produce the paper and that, therefore, my theory of wanting everything to be identified is a little nullified by the daily practice of newspapers.

We, all of us, carry a little water on both shoulders perhaps in many issues, but anyhow if we are going to go into new modes of the delivery of information, it has got to be financed and will require, I suppose, a stupendous investment. I don't see any reason in the world why the taxpayer should pay for this particular transitional change. When and how it will come about, I don't know, but this is part of the general picture which you asked me about. In other words, the role of the newspaper in providing information.

I would not be surprised if 15 years from now newspapers will be news resources with a different kind of relationship. I cannot stop without saying something which I believe to be a very emotional belief, that I believe in very emotionally and very profoundly, and that is written language, the printed word, and not just the spoken word and not just the image, will remain a highly vital method of communication. You may be able to tell me who it was who said that the two greatest inventions of the human race were written language and money. Be that as it may, I don't think, with due respect to the distinguished savants who have said otherwise, I don't think that written language is going to cease to be a very vital part of communications. Therefore, I think that the newspaper in some form, printed and written language in some form, will be a very important method of communication, and I believe that in part because written communication, printed or otherwise, has the immense advantage of permitting the consumer to consume it at his own pace, in his own way, rereading or stopping or having a nap or doing what he likes. This is a form of individual communication as contrasted with mass communication, at which the listener or viewer is to some extent at the mercy of the time factor and the pace of other people.

Therefore, I think the individualized communication of written language will remain important to the human race, and this is a good word for libraries as well as it is for newspapers.

MS. MOORE: Mr. Canham, we certainly thank you for your very erudite testimony and we invite your continued interest in the Commission as a trustee of the library, as a businessman and as a member of the Fourth Estate.

CHAIRMAN BURKHARDT: The next witness is Mr. Chenevert, Portland Public Libraries, Portland, Maine.

Did I get your name right, Mr. Chenevert?

MR. CHENEVERT: Yes, you did, sir.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I felt terribly humble when you put me on after Mr. Canham, but I was sitting there wishing you would put me on the first thing this morning before everybody got here or late this afternoon, after everybody had gone home early. The only comforting thought was that he did come from Auburn, Maine. Since I was a Maine man, maybe that helps the situation.

I am really wearing two hats. One hat I am wearing here is as chairman of the New England Library Board's panel of councillors. If you have read my written testimony, which I hope you have --

CHM. BURKHARDT: We have.

MR. CHENEVERT: -- the panel of councillors is a 40-member advisory group which serves the six New England states' librarians acting as compact administrators of the New England interstate library district. That is one hat, and I will be glad to do anything that I can on that level with you, but really and truly I am the library director of the Portland, Maine Public Library and I have been sitting here hearing about oceans of knowledge, and I know of 60 or 70 million items in the Library of Congress, and I know there are 85 miles or so of shelving in the London Museum, and I was interested to hear the analysis by the mathematician who predicted that simply in science and medicine or in two or three fields alone there are some million articles yearly and that probably already in just those fields there are 30 million papers or authored articles.

I sit here up in Portland, Maine and I have 1600 periodical titles and we get about 700 periodicals and I am a "biggie." We are probably one of the largest libraries in Maine. If you took all the libraries in Maine and put them together, we would be lucky if we could give you 2 million books. When I think of that ocean of knowledge, I feel like a trout fisherman sitting on the bank of a stream.

So how can I get my Maine people access to this whole big ocean of knowledge that you people are all thinking about? It has direct application to us. I try to look at it from my own point of view and from the point of view that you have in trying to put together a national program, and it says in your document here that one of the things that you are concerned with here is with planning and design of networks and so forth.

So I submit to you that one of the first things you have got to do is to look at planning as a continuous process of revision and so forth and you need a dialogue. The hearings are great. You have had some wonderful people here today, and I think you people are all terrific. I know from your questions and from what you have done already that you sincerely have worked on it, and that is what I am going to say nice about you.

The thing that I really want to say is that if you are going to plan something, you have got to get everybody involved in the planning, and let us go back to little old Maine: 350 miles from top to south and 200 miles wide and less than a million people. I serve the largest city of Maine with only 65,000 people in it. We have got to plan and design our own things, and all that you can help us with--God bless you, but you need our input and you are getting it now or you will be getting it through the New England Library Board, because at least we have got six people in Maine who drive all the way down to Worcester or some place and we get together with Connecticut and Rhode Island and all these other nice people and we get our two cents' worth.

Somehow your offer of other documents and testimony have got to be the basis for dialogue or planning and it is not a finished document that you are going to put together and put the cover on it and send it to the printer or something. It is going to be a continuous thing, and you need all the input you can get. How you do it, I don't know, because that is so much for planning.

You have asked a lot today about categorical grants and revenue-sharing, so let me put my two cents in on that.

It is not an either/or question to start with. Fundamentally, I am a profound believer in revenue-sharing. I would much rather eyeball it with my local city manager and my city council if the federal government will send some money back to the poor property taxpayers in Portland,Maine. For $9.50 per capita, if I can get some federal money back from Portland, I would rather go to them and ask for it than go to the federal government. I have got $30,000 in a bookmobile with facilities for the handicapped, and I can pull it off with $30,000 in categorical grants through the state library. I had to stand on my head to get that $30,000. I put my blood into it. You don't know how far you can go, but you have to be ready and learn what kind of jargon to use. You have to second-guess them. For example, "disadvantage" flows all through my report. If you went to a model cities meeting in Portland, Maine, they would throw you out on your ear. They are not disadvantaged; they are residents of a model neighborhood, and there is a vast distinction, let me tell you. So this whole business of playing the game -- that it has got to go through the process, you know -- and I have to write the thing according to the criteria, and you are sitting there in the Office of Education or in Boston or in any other place or in a state library or any place and you have got your own preconceptions of the kind of things you are looking for. If it is minorities, I am in. If it is Indians, I am in. If I can slant it to help the poor blind person, in. I have got to second-guess you to get that money. I would much rather have the money go back to the local community, sit down with the city manager and say, "Look, Buster, here is a good program and I want the dough." I don't always get it.

I lost $30,000 one night, or at 1:30 in the morning, to a man for a sewer. The gavel was all ready to fall and I had my $100,000 toward capital improvements and so forth. Some little guy raised his hand and said, "Mr. Chairman, may I speak? We have a problem with a sewer in my neighborhood." To make a long story short, after an hour's time, at 1:30 in the morning, one city councillor says, "I move to take $30,000 from the library, and give it to that man for his sewer," and they did.

So the point is: They are both very necessary at this stage in the game.

As far as revenue-sharing, in all of Maine we have been lucky if we got $25,000. I asked for $80,000 and they promised me I would get it. Sorry, at the last minute I got $11,300 , and that was to fund this bookmobile. So I got the bookmobile to start with a federal categorical grant that I had been promised from the state library for five years of LSCA funds, but the money dried up until LSCA, so I went to them on my hands and knees very bravely to try to get the grant from model cities and they did not have enough money. They were getting hit right and left, too. All of a sudden they said, "Okay, here is your $11,300 for the rest of the year."

Now the city is taking it over and it was demonstration money. I had tried to get more federal money and didn't get it but ended up getting it through the regular city operating budget. So I am very ambivalent about getting categorical funds, but in one way it is worthwhile. I would like to see the money go to the state library and then I could go to the state library with the plan and say, "Here is a good program." But I hate this whole hierarchy of going to someone in Boston, someone in Washington and so forth. That is all I have to say about revenue-sharing, unless you have any more questions.

Mr. Lerner and I exchanged a few words outside the meeting about school library cooperation. Everybody talks about the fact that it is non-existent or it is lip service and so forth, but in Maine we do all kinds of school library cooperation. It gets down to federal money again. We had a federal task force and they said, "If you took all the public libraries in Maine (we have got 250), you could not put together one decent audio-visual collection."

If you cannot lick them, join them. Where was I going to get a million dollars together? I didn't have a film and I didn't have a projector.

The schools get half the money; they get half the property tax and half the state budget, so we got a $30,000 grant, one LSCA grant, and I said to them, "We will give you the $30,000 if you will get us the audio-visual collection to use," and they agreed to that, so they built it with federal funds along the way and they now fund it with 11 school districts run by 11 school superintendents. Now the public libraries are in it and we all share it.

The point is that it was seed money, this LSCA money.

Then they said, "Okay then, Eddie, you are making a case for a categorical grant." Well, I am, but if you realized all that went into writing that proposal and if you see how I write my criteria and my objectives and my summaries and blah, blah, blah, it would have been much simpler if I went straight to the state library and said, "Look, I have got $30,000 and I know how I can pull off a one and a half million-dollar deal." So now we loan out the films and we use them with schools, senior citizens, preschool children, emotionally disturbed children and the cerebral palsy center.

We don't own a film. What do we do? We borrow them. The Maine State Library cooperates with New Hampshire and Vermont and they have a pool of films, a couple of thousand films. We borrow them and lend them. We turn around and do the same thing with this audio-visual deal and now they have as many as two or three thousand films over there.

So there is teamwork and school cooperation, at least in Maine, and cooperation is unselfish cooperation, whether you are talking about networks or anything else. So they gave us all kinds of things in return for that. Incidentally, that $30,000 went out a long time ago. We do now fund it locally at so much per capita, 8 cents per capita, and we are funding a librarian at this center and we have the use of all this other stuff free because of this school-library cooperation.

The other thing I want to talk about, and then I will shut up andgo home, is this business of what libraries are about and all this new technology sort of thing. How did the new technology help the Portland, Maine Public

Library? Let me show you: We have two professional catalogers and four clerk-typists. We buy about 11,000 books per year. We get a lot of our catalogs free through a New Hampshire federated thing with federal funds, or else we buy them from Library of Congress at about 35 cents a pack. Then from NELINET, which you all know about, we get our terminal and cards through NELINET.

As far as the card cataloging, we have 143,000 in our schools and we can do that for 18 cents a pack of cards or whatever.

The thing I am trying to say is that the new technology will relieve librarians of manual tasks so that they can go out and do the kind of things they ought to be doing. I can see the time when I will have 17 professional librarians and paraprofessionals who will be spending half of their time out in the community. How can I pull that off? The only thing I can do is that when they are not processing overdue notices, when they are not cataloging and all that sort of thing, so that anything you can do on networks, the computers and networks would give us access to these things. This helps librarians and creates transmission of knowledge to decision-makers and helps the community people solve their own community problems.

Thank you very much.

Do you have any questions?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you. We have a few brief questions.

MS. MOORE: I don't want to ask a question. I want to make a comment.

As an old professional grant writer, you are the only person that I have ever known to put it into the words that I would have like to have said.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: When you shared the audio-visual collection with the schools, did you have to pay anything to the schools?

MR. CHENEVERT: No, ma'am.

MS. WU: It is absolutely free?

MR. CHENEVERT: Absolutely free. We put in some money and we said, "We will throw in $30,000 if you let us use your facilities," and they said, "Okay."

MS. WU: What about personnel, the staff hours involved in the processing?

MR. CHENEVERT: The staff hours -- actually, the money we put in pays for the library. The public library coordinator who is stationed at that center to coordinate our public library efforts with the school system, that is.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chenevert, for this very good testimony.

I would next like to call on Ms. Lydia Goodhue, the Chairman of the Board of Library Commissioners in Boston, Massachusetts.

You have been sitting here all day.

MS. GOODHUE: I know. It has been very interesting. I have learned a lot.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have great fortitude.

MS. GOODHUE: I promised in our statement to deliver four documents to you, and which I will now do. In addition to that, because of the evidence, I should summarize what they are.

This is our Library Planning Study in Massachusetts, the State-Aided Regional Public Library System Evaluation, the Massachusetts Long-Range Program and The Plan for the Development of State Educational Media Services to Local Schools.

Now, in addition to that, I have discovered that you have this interest through the testimony this morning, this interest in revenue-sharing, so relative to our office I am also adding a summary of revenue-sharing in Massachusetts and how the libraries have fared. I will leave that with you because that is a specific list of all the libraries that got revenue-sharing and for whatever expense was involved.

However, I do want to say, just for the general information of everybody, that 75 Massachusetts public libraries received a total of about $2.7 million in local revenue-sharing funds; roughly $700,000 of this was for capital expenses, while $200 million went for operating expenses.

And the kicker is this: We don't know how much of this money --

CHM. BURKHARDT: You did not mean $200 million?

MS. GOODHUE: $2 million. If I said 200 million, I am obviously --

CHM. BURKHARDT: Dreaming.

MS. GOODHUE: -- dreaming. We do not know how much of this money went for additional library service. Most libraries were able to report that their receipt of revenue-sharing funds was just a kind of bookkeeping fact, that the town simply used the money for its simple budget regular items somewhere. This would also be a part of what I am giving you.

The last is simply a listing of the LSCA special projects of last year and the year before with an evaluation, as some of them have already been alluded to; and I know you have questioned Secretary Cronin about these, and we think they are fascinating, and I hope you do, too.

So there is possibly more than you would care to know about Massachusetts library projects.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: You mentioned your uncertainty of your position in state government. What is this likely to be resolved into? Is this still pending, this decision?

MS. GOODHUE: Yes, it is still pending. The decision -- the reorganization plan which Secretary Cronin has sponsored is in the hands of the Recess Committee and will go into the next state legislature. We had long felt that the state library agency should have a highly visible position in the state government. So that is what we are seeking. At the moment it is a question of negotiating with him and with the legislature as to exactly what the nature of that would be. But I don't think it is going to be less visible. I think our trend is certainly toward more and more an important level.

MS. MOORE: Are you now an independent agency or are you with the Department of Education?

MS. GOODHUE: We are with the Department of Education. We were an independent agency. In fact, we were the first one in the nation; and when there was a general reorganization in the state government, it was decided there would only be 20 departments, and so we were put in with the Department of Education.

MS. SCOTT: You touched on the Arthur D. Little study. Can you further explain why the libraries are not cooperating? You just mentioned in part that it was due to the incentives toward funding. Are there any other reasons given in the study?

MS. GOODHUE: Yes. Well, I think that some of the professional reasons have been given today, and as a lay person I will take their word for that -- that in fact there are some librarians who just are not as cooperation-conscious as others, nor are there users that demand it in some cases. But I think, generally speaking, we have gone under the assumption that if the people are asked to share their resources, that they should be given some reason to do so and it should not actually hurt their own financial picture.

MR. LORENZ: As I understand it, both public and school libraries are under the jurisdiction of your commission; is that correct?

MS. GOODHUE: Yes. As a matter of fact, it is not just those. We are not by any means a public school or a public, in-school library agency. Our concern is with all kinds of libraries. We, for example, have been dealing, as you know, through the federal program with county institutional and state institutional libraries and all networking, which involves special libraries, too.

MR. LORENZ: Have you tried using your state aid for public and school libraries to provide an incentive for public school library cooperation?

MS. GOODHUE: Yes, we have, and speaking of the state aid, we have put before the legislature, and it is still there, a bill calling for more funding for some of these other programs. At the moment the state funding is almost entirely for public library service, which includes original public library service.

MR. LORENZ: What has your success been in getting public and school library cooperation through state-funded centers?

MS. GOODHUE: We could certainly use more public and school library cooperation. One of the things which I said in the prepared remarks is that we really do think that we could use some help with the school library area. We don't see the urge for reform or even for cooperation emerging from the local leadership, either the local school library leadership or the school committee leadership. In many instances we have discovered, for example, in service to people needing special education, that they have to be urged by some other means, such as state or federal funds.

MR. LERNER: I would like to ask you another question about funding of libraries. In your testimony you say in regard to school libraries that people conceive of schools as being supported entirely by local taxes, and yet this is not working. It is true, in fact, in most states that libraries are also supported by mainly local property taxes.

MS. GOODHUE: That is true here.

MR. LERNER: And, in fact, that is not working. Now, what are the alternatives?

MS. GOODHUE: I think what I meant is that if the local funding is the predominant source of funding and then the local people were the predominant source of, say, change or improvement, all right, fine, that would be okay, but in this instance it does not seem to be working. I think that my answer to your question is that we have been able to accomplish things with the federal money in the way of leadership.

MR. LERNER: Well, what I am really getting at is something more than that, but there are obviously federal funds that are coming into library programs. What I am really getting at is: Should in fact libraries be financed on a different basis? Let us say there has been some discussion of schools no longer being tied to the local property tax but rather on a broader level. Would libraries be helped by that situation or not?

MS. GOODHUE: I think that more and more we have been turning to other modes, which is the word that I picked up today. For example, in the regional systems and with the state minimum standards and with perhaps the networking at a local level, such as in Worcester and in our Hampshire interlibrary, which is not just one city but is several communities.

T12 So that I would say that where the money is, is where the power is to effect a change. So it depends upon where you want to effect the change, and I guess what we were simply saying is that the catalyst for effecting change has not been emerging from the localities in many cases.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mrs. Wu.

MS. WU: From the revenue-sharing funds, did you allocate any amount to the school libraries? You said it was 2.7 million?

MS. GOODHUE: Yes. The details of this report refer to the public library funds.

MS. WU: You did cover the school libraries?

MS. GOODHUE: Well, this would only be public libraries. We have a peculiar situation in Massachusetts, and I don't know if it applies to other states, and that is, that our school committees have fiscal autonomy, which means that they can set their budget and have their say within certain limits.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you, Ms. Goodhue.

I call now on Ms. Janice Gallinger, College Librarian, Plymouth State College, of the University of New Hampshire.

MS. GALLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Would you like to amplify on the written remarks that you sent in to us, or would you want to add to them or what?

MS. GALLINGER: Well, I have a few things that I would like to add, but you said in your letter that you had questions to ask, so perhaps --

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, I think if you want to add something, you can do that now.

MS. GALLINGER: All right. I have read last night the draft which you sent to us. Of course, I did not have terribly much time to ponder about it since it only came yesterday afternoon.

One of the thoughts that kept recurring to me as I was reading it is the element, the human element, involved in this whole problem. Representing the north rural areas, I think we are probably more conscious of this than people in the urban areas: What effort is included in this, in the thinking behind it, to orient the users in remote areas to take advantage, even if there are terminals or centers for assistance within a 25-mile radius perhaps of their homes. I think this is a very real problem. It does no good to have the technology if the people can't reach it.

I don't know what you have thought of this but, you know, I see nothing of it in the report. That is why I raise the question.

I also thought, as I read it through, just having read "Diversity by Design" and being quite hung up on the Fourth Revolution, that somehow there should be some overlap with computer centers and technology centers centers serving both education and libraries because there is tremendous overlap in the purpose in both cases, particularly as we expand into more continuing education products and using public libraries as continuing education centers, and the bibliographic control of packages that might be used. This leads in to the cataloging problem of non-print materials which will form a great part of the large packages.

I would like to expand on what I wrote in my testimony on the subject of cataloging of non-print materials. For about five years we have been attempting, with some degree of success, I think, to promote the use of non-print materials as well as printed materials in a college setting. We have recently come to a point of discouragement primarily because of the lack of cataloging availability and the enormous amount of in-house cataloging, and the material is simply no good to anybody if it is not cataloged. There is no reason in the world that it should not be completely and equally available to all the users.

Now, we have set aside other work in order to get some of these materials out and on the shelves in response to complaints from faculty for materials that we have known about for about a year. You may say, well, I have a cataloging compartment; that may well be true. On the other hand, they have appeared on the LCA catalogs, but we cannot get cards. If you ever listen to a cassette tape in order to listen to its contents, it is a very time-consuming proposition in terms of staff time, but there is no other way to catalog it if you don't know what it says. So I think those are the primary points that I would amplify my written testimony with.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you. Any questions? Mr. Dunlap.

MR. DUNLAP: In your testimony you stated that you were participating in NELINET and have become an affiliate of OCLC, at which time you were obliged from your participating in NELINET, because of expanding costs, you would expect almost the contrary to happen.

MS. GALLINGER: I think perhaps our situation is not the ordinary one. Since 1968, we have purchased cataloging service from the University of New Hampshire through a cooperative cataloging unit at approximately the cost of $2.50 per volume. This means that we have a relatively small catalog department, we have no staff to turn over to terminal maintenance, because the cataloging staff we do have is strictly in a supervisory situation, and particularly concerned with those things which cannot be provided through a computer access, original cataloging, et cetera. So in order to do it, we would have to add persons, in addition to the fact that I think -- and I don't have my facts absolutely 100 percent sure -- it was going to cost in January of 1972, I believe, approximately $6,000; and by April, when we met at Dartmouth, it had gone up about $14,000. I simply -- and the state of New Hampshire, with our internal budgetary situation as it is -- could not make any kind of three-year commitment, which is what we were being asked to do, bearing an equal jump in cost in a very short period, a three-year jump in cost.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any more questions?

Mr. Stevens.

MR. STEVENS: What should be the Commission's stand on copyright for non-print materials and how do you feel that the Commission ought to interpose itself in this heated debate in which there seems to be no middle ground for anyone who wants to retain his sanity?

MS. GALLINGER: We each get in our corners and come out with boxing gloves on, I guess. I think that if this is a national agency -- and I think that is one of the questions -- should it become a national agency currently, which I think it should, that it should represent the point of view of all kinds of library use.

I don't think we can hide under fair use in the educational community which they have been attempting to do, but I do think that if the library world is to be represented by this Commission, then all kinds of materials that are suitable for use in libraries should be of concern to it. I think to limit it only to concern for copying pages from periodicals or copying of book pages is a very short-sighted approach.

For instance, assume we do have cassettes for the cataloged, assume that everyone in a consortium owns thousands of cassettes and that they share those thousands of cassettes, say, by ten members in a consortium. They will never each buy 10,000 cassettes. This is never going to affect the profit of the producer. They will also be replacements. Cassettes are only one thing. There are films, film strips, sound film strips, some things which are easily reproduced for a video tape format which can be shown perhaps within the library community. This is now something which cannot be done.

I have just been through this with several producers and they are very adamant about it. Perhaps I should have kept my mouth shut and not have asked, but we were trying to get answers.

I think this is a particular service because as a public library, educationally it assumes educational responsibilities because this is the kind of thing that the public library might be doing, and yet it cannot. I think these are terribly important concerns and I think there must be written into the legislation those things which are legitimate and which do not interfere with profit.

I don't know whether that answers the question of what you can do except to make recommendations and testify, I suppose, be concerned.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have made the case which has been made by the library community, but there is, as you may know, an opposite view. The very thing is, does it interfere with the profit, and for that, where is the evidence, one way or the other?

MS. GALLINGER: All right. I can only speak from my own experience. I would much rather buy 25 different packages than to buy 25 duplicates of the same package, if I have the technology in-house to duplicate the one, so I think that by having the opportunity to duplicate,in fact, my money would be spent to encourage additional production.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Is there another question?

Well, then thank you very much.

We go next to Mr. Richard Huleatt, Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation of Boston, Massachusetts.

Before we do that, let us give our recorder a five-minute break.

[Whereupon, a short recess was taken.]

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Huleatt, would you tell us what your position is with Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation?

MR. HULEATT: I am technical information manager for Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation. I am in charge of their library, which is one of the oldest special business libraries in the City of Boston, and certainly one [illegible] the most active special libraries in Boston today.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Good. Now, you submitted testimony which we have all read, but perhaps you would like to enlarge on it or say something about it. I believe you received that draft statement of ours.

MR. HULEATT: I would be delighted to.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Suppose you state your reaction.

MR. HULEATT: First of all, I want to congratulate the Commission in what I feel is a step in the right direction about your proposal toward a national program, and I was very pleased to note the many similarities between my testimony and the program.

CHM. BURKHARDT: That's right.

MR. HULEATT: It is long overdue. I think what has happened over the period of years and in a de facto situation is that we have created a tower of Babel, and I would visualize that system that we have today as sort of an old inner tube with hundreds of patches on it and the air still leaking out.

Certainly one of the points that you made in your proposed program was utilization of the federal telecommunications system, which I must admit I did not think of, but I think it is a tremendous idea. Certainly one of the things that faces us -- whether it is on a personal basis or whether it is in the field of business or industry: Every decision that is made is very much dependent for the support of information that we have in hand. The lack of that information can create liabilities for us. And I have particularly in mind, which I am sure that you have read in the newspapers, when Mr. Nader was out in Pennsylvania at the Pennsylvania Department of Insurance: The safety of nuclear power plants,for one. I think you read last year of a dam disaster in West Virginia which had to do with the construction of a dam that had been built many years ago. We need complete information whenever we are going to undertake any task. It may mean that if we don't have that information, we are going to head in the wrong direction or it is something that ultimately we -- and I say that "we" collectively in terms of the American public -- are going to pay for.

The public is not concerned with our

methodology. They are concerned with relevant answers and the speed with which we obtain those answers.

Now, I entered this field more than fifteen years ago as a dissatisfied user because I felt that there was a better way that information could be obtained, and I feel that the Commission has that objective in mind also. There has to be a better way to do it.

Now, certainly the biggest collector and collection of information, whether it be in libraries or information centers -- and let us face it, those two terms, "information centers" and "libraries" are hopelessly intertwined. Certainly any beginning has to start with the federal government and certainly it is recognized that whether we want to call them national libraries or information centers or information analysis centers or federal agencies, that presently it is a hodge-podge, whether they are mission oriented, all created under various public laws, there has to be some sense of direction at which we have to go.

Previous legislation has to be superseded under one public law, in my opinion, hopefully with the creation of a national information center, a national information agency, which would initiate what I would term a national information policy. This would have to be its own agency. It cannot be a weak sister to any of the existing agencies because there are so many vested interests, so many precedents established that would impede a real program.

I think that in the package that you have presented under this program you have considered nearly all of these. Of course, it has to be elaborated. There have to be specifics, but it has to be a logical conclusion, as I have stated in my written testimony, in order to gain any kind of Congressional support.

One thing that is very much "in" today, of course, is having money; and the first thing that this program would do would be to save millions of dollars. I think it is evident, I think it is logical and I believe there has to be a natural order of progress, beginning with the federal government and then relating to state governments, and from there on to local communities; and I think that the federal government has to serve as a model for what will take place, and I think -- look what the Commission is doing and will probably undertake -- is to take the best of those systems, which may be presently existing, perhaps modify them, merge them into a cohesive program which would be applicable to all types of libraries and information centers, whether they be public, academic, special, school or whatever.

I see this as a general view. I think that the special library, particularly, gets involved with all types of libraries. Sometimes we are called parasitic because we have a rather small collection, but we do get involved with these federal agencies and we do get involved with these public libraries and we are aware of their problems. It is very inconsistent from coast to coast.

Each day I telephone from coast to coast and we probably contact twenty states in the course of each day by by telephone to obtain information, not to mention other international sources that we draw from. In the business world one of the things which we must be presently aware of is the growing technology and advances from Europe and Japan, and these people,particularly in Japan, are quite aware of what information can do for them.

I really believe that if we don't take action within the next two years, that we are simply going to be just literally edged out of the market. I believe that it is not just business interests, you might say, information. I think it covers all of the fields of knowledge, whether it be science, industry, education, because libraries and information centers cover all of man's knowledge. That is quite a responsibility.

CHM. BURKHARDT: With this national information center that you speak of or agency, you say that should have authority over the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and so forth. Would that involve transferring the Library of Congress from the legislative to the executive branch or not? Have you considered that problem?

MR. HULEATT: I think it's got to be something under a new public law which will not give any one of the three major segments of government a vested interest in it. I know that would be a rather difficult thing to do, but I think that it has got to be, to serve all three major areas of government.

MS. SCOTT: Well, we could hardly expect Congressional approval for that measure, to put the Library of Congress under another agency or center.

MR. HULEATT: I think certainly Congress is going to be aware, and certainly there are inherent dangers in what I term a national information center from the point of expression of information, and certainly today I would say that Congress would be wary in putting all, literally all, of your eggs in one basket. I think if the responsibility be shared, this is a possibility, but certainly it should not be vested in any one single element of government.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Cuadra.

MR. CUADRA: I was impresssed by your understanding of the scientific and military information system of our country. For two days I had the chore of explaining our system to an official delegation from the Soviet Union and they found some parts of our scientific and intelligence information system totally incomprehensible. And when we think about theirs, one of the things they thought incomprehensible was the role of free enterprise. I have a question about one of your suggestions, about the provision of data base services as one of the functions of this agency.

You recognize that there are a number of private companies already doing this. What would be the mechanism for transition, if there is one, from something that is now being done privately to something that, I gather, you would propose be done in public?

MR. HULEATT: Well, when I say publicly, too, I mean on a cost basis. I think what Mr. Canham was talking about was hidden fees, and I think we do pay for everything. I think every system as proposed has to be on a pay-as-you-go basis. I don't believe in a 100 percent subsidy. I think you mentioned a program or a subsidy to get things started, but certainly the commercial services which are available in using the existing data bases -- I think you will recognize when we started back in 1963 and the other agencies in 1966 and 1967, they went up. What about all the knowledge beforehand? What about all the agencies that have all the information that may not be on a data basis? Certainly one of the areas that I am quite aware of that has neither been abstracted nor indexed or announced is the tremendous amount and bulk of information that the Atomic Energy Commission has on file. And unless you know that that information is there, you might just as well forget about it.

In data bases, one of the greatest time-consuming things that we get involved with is the search of relevant information for a particular project or a particular effort. The use of a data terminal would let us search that information in a much shorter period of time. It would also allow us the capability of a printout, that is, a hard copy which we can take with us, although which we can keep and we don't have to keep calling into the data center for the information. But certainly the amount of data bases that are available presently do not even begin to encompass all the information that is available within the federal government.

MR. CUADRA: Let me pursue this just one bit.

If there is a data base that has already been made available through a commercial organization and they have invested in doing this, what would you do about that? Are you recommending that the federal government go into, in effect, competition with the private enterprise or what?

MR. HULEATT: No. I think that I mentioned a few minutes earlier that one of the things that I would assume the Commission to do is to pick and choose the best of each. This would mean if there were already existing programs in the private sector, let's say, utilizing the government data basis, and it could be proven that industry could produce this more efficiently, let us say, than the federal government going into that particular business, yes, I say that the private sector should do this. I think that you would have to do it on a cost-comparison basis. I think that it is not just going to be in this particular area data bases or services; I think you got into this on micro-publishing. I think you are getting into this in a number of government services in which private industry is producing information which is essentially federal information, and I would assume that this Commission would pick and choose on an evaluation basis which of those is least costly and most efficient.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Andy, we have time for another question. Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: A few years ago we ran what we called a national engineering information and data symposium in Washington in which we put all of the major groups involved in engineering information together that we, too, defined both in terms of the industrial sense and the information community that supported it.

I can recollect that during that conference strong comments were made that engineers did not necessarily want to partake of the kind of data banks that the federal agencies were providing. It made much to-do about the fact that information among engineers as reflected in the Rosenbloom Studies flowed from word to word, from mouth to mouth, if you will, and this indicated to us at that time that most of the engineering community was not really concerned as sharply as you are about federal sources of information. Has anything changed since that time?

MR. HULEATT: I think the phrase used at that time became "technological gatekeepers," am I correct?

And, yes, things have changed. You now have Atomic Energy Commission regulations. You now have Environmental Protection Agency regulations. You have Occupation, Safety and Health Act regulations. We alone are spending 600 percent more than we were five years ago for information, and the end is not in sight.

All of a sudden firms that never were really concerned with environmental or public safety to the extent that they are today are only doing so have been stimulated, let us put it that way. They had the responsibility before now, but they have been given some sense of direction. This is not a criticism of the industry; this is just a fact of life.

I think the word "ecology" means something more to us today than it did ten years ago. We happen to have more knowledge. I think the engineers are much more concerned today with what they design and build than they have ever been before.

MR. AINES: Let me ask the last half of that question, if I might.

The federal agencies pride themselves on the announcements and dissemination of their technical reports that they turn out through the National Technical Information Service, space, defense, documentations center, AEC -- they all have elaborate programs. Now, from what I read in your document, you are stating in effect that these are not successful systems.

MR. HULEATT: I would not say that they are not successful systems. I am just saying that they are widely separated and incomplete. I would say that NTIS particularly is probably the agency to which I would funnel most of the future programs in terms of distribution and announcements of information. I would say it is probably one, in my opinion of the better run agencies, one of the better run services that I see today in terms of announcements, better services in terms of distribution, in terms of organization, but NTIS does not get everything. What about GPO? What about the other federal agencies? What about the USGS? There is a tremendous amount in the distribution business and they are all doing it different ways, and NTIS is way out in the field. They are not getting the responsibility to handle it and all that we are doing is patching up a system and not creating something new. I mean in terms of our creating something with a single-mindedness of purpose.

Sure, these are improvements on existing things, but is it really that much of an improvement? MNTIS is just a piece of it, yet it is frustrating to know that, you know, where the information is and yet it is not available for that agency. In fact, just two weeks I had to go to Rome to get a fisheries bulletin, which is rather ridiculous.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you, Mr. Huleatt, and we must move on, but I want to encourage you to send us your reactions and criticisms of that draft that you were talking about.

I would like to next call on Mrs. Eleanora P. Harman, the school library media consultant in the Department of Education in Montpelier, Vermont.

Mrs. Harman, how nice to have you with us. Did you want to comment further on the paper that you sent us or comment on that draft proposal?

MRS. HARMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This is the first time that I have ever appeared before such an august body and I must say that I am terribly awed and feel slightly inadequate after hearing some of this magnificent testimony ahead of me.

I did not receive your draft, unfortunately, but I got it just a few minutes ago when I came in, so I have not had a chance to read it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: When you do read it, please write to us about it, will you?

MRS. HARMAN: Yes, sir, I certainly will. I did not know whether it would help the Committee, but of course, my chief work is with school children and when we have people speaking in these great awesome terms of world trade and all of this business, I sometimes wonder where the little kids are going to fit in.

Vermont is a state of some 9,000 square miles
and the total population is 400,000, which means it is
very rural. The greatest need is for library services
T13 is in the elementary schools. We try to encourage the
cooperation of the public school libraries. This is
helping out, but we still are in tremendous need.

As one who is deeply involved in the education of our youth and working with higher education and continuing education, I am most concerned that youngsters learn how to learn, so that when they finish their formal schooling they will be able to continue to learn, and I am now sure how we can give them these skills if we cannot provide good, total library services.

I can also see that possibly some network systems might even help down in the pre-school level as sort of preventive medicine-type work.

I also agree with Arlene Hope, that if we are going to have a system, a national or a federal system, a great big job of education is going to be ahead of you people, all of us, in order to educate the public about this system. I work with too many people who are still afraid to thread a 16-millimeter projector.

Any questions?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Do the Commission members have any questions?

Joe Becker.

MR. BECKER: When you speak of the deficiencies at the elementary school level, can you amplify that a little bit?

MRS. HARMAN: Yes, I can. I just happen to have some statistics. There are 353 elementary schools in Vermont, of which 72 percent have inadequate book collections, 93 percent have inadequate space, 79 percent have inadequate visual collections and 95 percent do not have qualified librarians.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes, Andy.

MR. AINES: In your statement, what would you say is the number of hours that children watch television?

MRS. HARMAN: I am sorry, I could not possibly make a guess on that. I have not seen any statistics and I would hesitate to say.

MR. LORENZ: Do you have some information or know of any research done on why some children who read at an early age become life-long readers and other children drop out after they leave school? Do you have any insights on this problem?

MRS. HARMAN: About the only thing I say is that an awful lot depends on the individual youngsters. I look at my own two kids -- well, they aren't kids any more, they are both grown -- but we treated them pretty much the same -- and one is a much greater reader than the other. So I cannot say that it is all parental influence, I cannot say it is all school influence. I think it is a combination of things. I am sorry, I don't even dodge the question.

MR. LORENZ: No. It is a very difficult question.

MR. BECKER: We just lived through a decade of federal aid through the elementary and secondary education act and I assume that money flowed to your state for materials, just as it did in some other states. Why then this very discouraging report in terms of deficiencies in Vermont?

MRS. HARMAN: The elementary schools in Vermont have not had state minimum standards. The secondary schools did, and in the state minimum standards for secondary schools, the libraries, the qualified librarians and space were required for the schools to be approved by the state Department of Education. This was not true in the elementary school level, and so they have,let's face it, been neglected.

The Title 2 program has done, I think, in my opinion more for the elementary school library services than anything that has hit the highway. It has made teachers and kids and parents aware of some of the needs and the new things that are available and it has made some of the communities aware of what some good elementary library services are.

Another problem is that the Department of Education has not had funding enough to have enough help or enough people on the staff.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Ms. Moore.

MS. MOORE: When you say "a qualified librarian," will you tell us by what standards you judge a qualified librarian? Is it so many semester hours of training, or what is it?

MRS. HARMAN: We have state standards for the high school librarians which indicate number of hours. By the way, these standards are at the moment under revision and we did not yet have state board approval on the new recommendations. When I say "qualified librarians," for the elementary schools actually I am being a little optimistic because I think a lot of communities would consider a qualified librarian as one who has the basic library skills of cataloging, book selection, administration, reference work with kids and teachers.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: You make a point that in small rural communities there are no well-qualified librarians for elementary schools. Do you now find that same condition exists in the same public libraries of those same rural communities if there are no professional librarians in the public library?

MRS. HARMAN: That is one of the big problems.

MR. CASEY: Has there been an effort by the Board of Trustees or by the Board of Education to hire one librarian on a one-time basis? For example, if the school library is open from 8:30 to 4:30, then there is a period where they might work on certain days of the week or on Saturday, or where now the public library is open all summer and so forth?

MRS. HARMAN: Right. Well, we are working on it. There are several communities now that are building new schools, elementary or sometimes 8 through 12, and they are giving serious consideration to having one librarian within the new school building that would service a school and a public library. We realize that this causes lots of problems and we try to get together with people. As a matter of fact, on Monday of this week I had just held such a conference at such a school and was working with people from the public library, with the public librarian and a trustee from the public library board as well as the school superintendent. You know, we were really trying to hack out some of these problems.

But it is an area in which some of these small communities think probably they can bring up library services.

MR. CASEY: That is your solution, I think.

MS. SCOTT: Have you considered training the paraprofessional? What are you doing in that respect?

MRS. HARMAN: Yes, indeed. As a matter of fact, some of the colleges in Vermont are now offering -- well, one college calls it library technician courses -- and these would be a big help.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I will take a final question from Ms. Moore.

MS. MOORE: The State Department of Education in Vermont used to have in-service programs for teachers to give them training in library services. Do they still have that?

MRS. HARMAN: Yes, ma'am. As a matter of fact, I was just conducting one last night, just getting one started.

MS. MOORE: Well, the reason I have great interest in this is that I taught for three years those courses at White River Junction and Johnson City and other places.

MRS. HARMAN: Oh, yes.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mrs. Harman.

I call now on Ms. Paula Corman, Director of Learning, North Shore Community College, Beverly, Massachusetts.

Would you like to add to your paper or make any remarks that you like before you ask questions?

MS. CORMAN: Thank you. I would first like to tell you that you have sitting before you an extraordinarily worried librarian. I am worried for a variety of reasons, and not the least of which is the summary of your proposal that I received just recently. I think the idea of networks is of tremendous importance, and from what I have heard sitting here today, I know we have to acknowledge them and we have to begin to work along those lines, but I am worried because, first of all, if the money comes into the state, I really feel that it has to have some kind of controls in place. Otherwise, the networks that are up and working out can tend to get overridden and I feel that the networks that are up and operative are obviously meeting a need within the state.

For example, the state colleges and community colleges and the state university have banded into a network whose acronym is something called MCCLPHEI, and that ghastly acronym stands for the Massachusetts Council of Chief Librarians of Public Higher Educational Institutions, and even that is a mouthful. This group has gotten together and started working for cooperative acquisitions and cataloging, but it does not go far enough. On the other hand, it is meeting a need and this is where I would like to see the money that does come into the state, if it does come in. I would like to see it strengthened, this kind of organization.

I think your program, as I have read it so far, does not go far enough, and I am about to voice a heresy here. I would like to see the use of libraries extended to people who never go near them. I feel that we have talked about the importance of the printed word but we have to recognize that in many of our communities today we have a large group of non-readers. They are not threatened by television -- that is not threatening to them -- and, therefore, I would like to see an allocation of funds within the state going to strengthening the concepts and the abilities of the cable television networks, the electronics that come out so that these people can become educated, can become viable resources within their own community but without being threatened themselves. I feel that is happening right now.

I worry about the fact that there are multiple kinds of information that people need and that in the course of a super-sophisticated system that might come up, the very basic survival needs of the under-educated, of the underserved are going to be overlooked. I would like to see something put into place in your considerations that takes cognizance of this.

I worry about the education in the library schools. I feel that that has to be upgraded.

I have in my college many people coming to me for jobs who are being prepared to be librarians of the 1900's. They are absolutely hassled, as has come out here before, by the concept of using a telephone basically, and an electronic charging machine or something can send them into a tailspin. I feel that our library schools unfortunately with very few exceptions, are still preparing people to work in the kind of library that is not automated, that does not have a prayer of getting automation, that is undersupported and, therefore, has to make do with the very basic, simple charging equipment. For instance, they are still stamping out books in our duplicate copies. I worry about those.

I worry also when you talk about the multi-state concept. I feel that there is need for regional systems and, as I indicated in my testimony, I think that this is important. On the other hand, realistically, and I think it is time we address this: Once the money comes into the state, it is going to become a political football, it is going to get disseminated to the people who have the largest and loudest amount of voices being heard. Librarians, I think, are terrifically dedicated people, but if I were a politician and I had to serve somebody, I would worry about the sewer in the neighborhood, not the library, because that is what is going to get me my votes and, therefore, I can see -- and I have had experience in working with network on a multistate basis and it became a political football to the point where the thing had to fold up and just drop out of sight.

Other than that, however, I think that the ideas that have come out today and in your testimony are tremendously interesting and I would like to see them go further.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, I would hope that a number of your worries would be removed when we go more deeply and you go more deeply into this draft of a national plan. For instance, I was unaware of what the apprehension is that you seem to have, that our national plan as now suggested would supersede any of the networks now in operation simply because it would be the plan we suggest. I think one thing we had in mind was that you grow up from the bottom and use the networks that are now working and tie them together. Now, maybe I misunderstood the document but that is the way I understand it.

MS. CORMAN: I did not see them. I did not see your plan as superseding it, but I was afraid that some of these existing ones would have to, because of dollars, be superseded and you would use a pragmatic approach to this.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I see.

John?

MR. LORENZ: Well, actually if the money came to the state level, would there not be a likelihood in terms of the democratic process, that it would be the existing systems that would have the largest clienteles that could bring their voices to bear on the state decision, rather than something new that would have no existing clientele?

MS. CORMAN: That is just the point. It is the existing ones that would have a voice, and what about the other ones that are not being addressed or perhaps inadvertently will not be addressed by the plan, since I think we all recognize that it can only go so far and we have not possibly touched all of the needs.

MR. LORENZ: I think I misunderstood your concern then. I thought you were concerned that the existing systems would be ignored and new systems would be created.

MS. CORMAN: I think that would happen to a degree, I think, realistically.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Stevens.

MR. STEVENS: Paula, I wonder if, aside from the comments you have already made, you would talk just a little bit about the community college library as a component of a network in an area or as a borrower and a lender in a network. We haven't heard from community college librarians in the course of the hearings, and perhaps the North Shore Community College has some general things to say about the community colleges in networks. Maybe you could share those ideas.

MS. CORMAN: I would love to, Chuck. I think the community college system in the state is an interesting one because it provides the nucleus of a network. Right now there is a grant that is operant within the state where the community colleges will be getting together with the public librarians of the communities who are serving or feeding in students to these community colleges, and there is out of this grant hopefully an attitude of mutual cooperation. The community college takes its responsibility in the community extraordinarily seriously. They want to be accessed. They are a community resource. God knows, they are being funded by the state and, therefore, they should be open, not only as far as courses and an open classroom, but the library and the learning resources of the institution should be open.

We are trying to see how -- and I have just finished developing a proposal to see a regional concept within Essex County, where North Shore is located, so that the community college can in some way augment the limited resources of some of the very small public libraries there.

The community college resources are now open to all of these libraries and the people who use them are welcomed into the institution.

Of course, the community college in my area functions with the community colleges around the state, so that there is an interaction between these institutions -- cooperative lending, cooperative borrowing, and hopefully down the pike cooperative cataloging will go on so that we will make better use and more efficient use of the resources that the state allocates to us.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Aines.

MR. AINES: Last night while reading all of these papers, I was also reading another publication called"Challenge to Leadership, Managing in a Changing World," by the Conference Board. It has just come out and probably has just now become available.

You will be interested to know that just by juxtaposition actually they were writing about the community college and its place in the educational scheme. I will just read one statement which should please you:

"The community college has become the most truly democratic of institutions of higher learning in America."

Explained in here was the reason for this, the fact that it is going to people needs rather than trying to emulate the universities of old. I think that I would like to tie it now to your comments that you made in your document, which seem to go to a different direction entirely, being concerned about the use of data banks and their underutilization.

What do you think we ought to do about trying to increase the amount of use of the systems that get cheaper by greater use?

MS. CORMAN: I wish I had a simple answer for that. I think that if they could become free, the use of them would increase to the point where, if a charge had to be made to access these data bases, the charge would be nominal or minimal. Again we get back to the concept of education. Until my administration and my college is aware of the value of information, I will never get any money strictly allocated for computer access, let us say, to these data bases.

It is cheaper, according to my administration, for my reference librarian to sit there and spend six hours on an information search. If there were some way of breaking this stalemate -- and in my testimony or my written testimony I am afraid I didn't hit it too hard because I haven't got the solution. This is where I think it comes, so I think you have got to start at the educational level and there has to be an infusion of money from some place so that it becomes demonstrable: the importance of the information to the faculty, to the students, to the administration itself, who still does not use the library, and in this way we can build up the usage so that we have a cost effectiveness and a break-even point -- not a break-even point, but at least it becomes less expensive.

MR. AINES: But don't you think these specialized data banks, which have only a limited appeal for certain types of installers or engineers or scientists, would not be the way to build up that confidence? Are these not too restrictive in their potential for a large group of students and university professors?

MS. CORMAN: I think it depends on what data bank you are referring to.

MR. AINES: Take the chemical information data, CAS.

MS. CORMAN: Okay, I can agree with that. I cannot see any community college students with that. I can't see any community college students using chemical abstracts or something like that. On the other hand, I can see my faculty wanting to use ERIC, and we have not got it now, unless I pay out of my library fine money. I think that is criminal. The people in the social sciences have no access whatsoever. I cannot afford something like the New York Times computer access to it and we have to do manual searches there not only for faculty but students alike. I think if the students were inculcated on a data basis as to whatever they needed, they would become the potential users in the future and would demand this from their libraries.

CHM. BURKHARDT: We have time for just one more question.

MR. CASEY: This is a two-part question. The first point that you made was that library use should be extended to those who don't go near them, and one of the ways of bringing the library to them was by means of CATV. So my question is: Give me an illustration of how a library might bring its resources to someone via CATV.

MS. CORMAN: Well, let me say that when I see this happening, I see it via an intermediary and that would perhaps be a video cassette. So, therefore, I would request from my local resource center -- and I distinguish that from the word "library" because I am wondering if the word "library" is not becoming an outdated term anyway. We are resource centers. I see my user coming to my resource center and requesting a video cassette, and that is plugged in somehow with an electronic gismo onto their set. I see my local library disseminating information, survival information, for people who are least likely to come into this institution and ask for it.

My Puerto Rican mother does not know of the resources available in my library, whether it is a public library or community college library, and she is not going to come to me to ask for the very fundamental survival information -- what to do when her kids get busted -- and, therefore, I see the two giving her this information, telling her the information sources already available up in her community.

MR. CASEY: And she gets this over CATV on her home receiver? Is that the point?

MS. CORMAN: I think she gets it either way, if she has the money, and I submit the people will have the money for the cable television, and this is an access to them. Of course, we have a problem of getting to tune in to that channel, but at least we have got a wedge in the door.

MR. CASEY: Or otherwise they come to this resource center and see this receiver on in this particular building?

MS. CORMAN: Yes.

MR. CASEY: So, therefore, they are coming to us to some extent.

MS. CORMAN: They will come, yes, but I don't think -- this is an initial step. I think it takes an awful lot of guts to come into a library.

MR. CASEY: The other point is, you see, if we expect you to receive information on a home receiver via CATV, that presupposes they will pay a monthly fee, which is a philosophy contradictory to our public library type of service: If you want this CATV service, you have to buy it, in a sense; whereas, in normal public libraries we give out books without any charge. So there is an inhibiting factor in the use of CATV.

MS. CORMAN: You are quite right about that. In the proposal I alluded to earlier, we foresaw a network being created around a community college that would in turn,with a large infusion of money, I might add, set up electronics satellites, within the various communities which would again be open to the public, since we are a community institution, and within that electronic satellite there would be the capability to use the cassettes and, of course, they would be free of charge to the community.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Joe Becker.

MR. BECKER: I was just going to mention to

Paula that in Casper, Wyoming they do have a CATV application which goes from the home to the resource center and back again. It does require that the individual does subscribe to CATV in his home, but if Channel 3 is his CATV station, there is a requirement in the franchise in Casper that public institutions have the right to transmit over Channel 3 at certain times of the day or all the time -- I don't know; whatever it may be -- so that it would work that an individual in his home would telephone for a resource and ask for something. He could not ask for it over the telephone or involve a response that was graphic in character, a map or picture or couple of pictures, and in his telephone he would be told over Channel 3 that he could get the information and he has a chance to see it.

MS. CORMAN: May I just say that in Tulsa, Oklahoma there is a system pretty much like that, Mr. Becker, whereby the individual telephones by the touchtone system to a teacher who is teaching, so that this is not very far down the pike.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You still have to pay $7.50 a month in order to subscribe, and your Puerto Rican mother is not going to have that money.

MS. CORMAN: I absolutely agree with you. However, if there were electronic centers -- and I know that sounds Orwellian -- if there were centers out in the communities, not in a formal institution -- in the church or community group, I think there is an outreach program that has to go to reach these people and then possibly some of this dissemination could go on.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you.

The next witness is Mr. Alan D. Ferguson, Wellesley, Massachusetts, the New England Board of Higher Education.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, again I am pleased to have this chance for a few minutes to chat with you.

As you know, perhaps from the materials that I have submitted in writing, which you have at least an abstract of in front of you, I am not here as a librarian; I am not even here as an information specialist. I am here as the administrative director of an agency which I suspect is probably doing more than any other single agency in the country at the moment. It is not very much, but it is more than anyone else is doing, to develop interstate regional delivery of information and expanded library services through the network.

Our agency, as I believe one of my colleagues testified this morning, Mr. Ronald Miller, is the official agency of the six New England states chartered by statute, ratified by the Congress, to assist these states on a cooperative basis to deliver improved educational facilities and opportunities for the citizens of this region.

Some years ago through the prodding of librarians, the agency undertook to sponsor and provide the necessary support services for the development of interstate library cooperative activities, and primarily relating to bibliographic service and technical service capacities which has resulted in what today is known as the New England Library Information Network.

This is a small but, I believe, extremely healthy organization with several members of it who have in fact testified today before your Commission, and some are still to come.

We have recently, through the support of the National Science Foundation, entered into a new and
T14 different but expanded activity along the same lines, and this is a large project whereby we hope to develop a regional and, this time, northeastern United States involving ten states and not six, academic science information centers.

Now, I had metioned in my testimony in writing that both of these activities address some of the Commission's immediate concerns. I cannot talk to you about the details of what should or should not be service to individual users, but I would underwrite, underscore the testimony given to you in writing and perhaps verbally this morning by Mr. Miller, that we at least in our organization are at the stage of development where we are not concerned about technology except its costs, but we are concerned to learn more of user habits and the user's relationship to the library as an information access point.

Our organization, as you can tell by its title, is primarily mandated to work with academic libraries, academic post-secondary libraries. Within the library information network we have responded to the requests of some public libraries in New England and they are active and thriving members of the services which are available to them through this interstate library network operation.

Turning to the statement which the Commission itself has issued concerning this hearing, my remarks will be brief and then, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Commission a question.

I am very sympathetic to the concept of

national planning, as I said in my written testimony, but I do believe the Commission, at least in its written statement which I have read, underestimates the potential for achieving your national goals through the medium of the interstate regional agencies such as the one that I represent. I believe, if it were further investigated by this Commission, it would be found to be an agency which would be useful, I happen to believe perhaps because of partiality, it is probably essential as a step toward your national effort. I believe the Commission underestimates this type of potential and I would place more hope here than the Commission now sees, and I would worry less about the peril which the Commission says it fears.

I agree that building a national library network on a state-by-state basis it is probably a self-defeating enterprise. So I urge the Commission to seriously investigate interstate regional arrangements and I think it is very obvious to you that the word "regional" is undoubtedly confusing. Some people call it "citywide," some people call it "townwide," some people call it"within the state." When we use the word we are talking about interstate activities, but there are three of in the country, as you well know -- the one I represent, the Western Interstate Commission, located at Boulder, Colorado, and the Southern Education

Board in Atlanta. Between us we serve the higher education interests of 32 of the 50 states. I would hold that this is not a bad bloc to begin with and I feel that you would find a great deal of capacity through these three agencies for cooperation in the development of the standards which are so essential, as we have found through the long laborious years and countless hours of conversation that we have had to undertake to establish the New England Library Information Network, and which we are now undertaking in the Northeast Science Information Center.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You were going to ask us a question.

MR. FERGUSON: My question, Mr. Chairman, is: Why, other than the statements which have been made about concern, in an ad hoc activity such as ours, such as the OCLC in Ohio, such as the other networks growing out in New York State and down in Texas and practically everywhere you can look -- why you object or why you place such little emphasis in your statements on the use of regional boards, whether it be our board or the southern board or any other conglomeration of state activities and as a step toward your national objective?

I get the impression, from reading your

statement, that you have hopes through your various researching and hearings of being able to establish a master plan which will somehow leapfrog over the local and state and the few existing regional arrangements which exist; and I said in my testimony that the managerial and logistical problems that this will encompass are so massive -- and I say this from six of our small states in New England -- that I shudder to believe that the actual implementation could be achieved in anything less than a decade.

So my question to you, ladies and gentlemen, is: What is wrong with interstate and regional operation?

CHM. BURKHARDT: I will ask the chairman of the committee that was responsible for producing this first draft to address himself to that question.

Joe.

MR. BECKER: Yes. I think that it was not a conscious or a deliberate, intentional desire to omit it, but having heard Ron testify this morning and now you this afternoon, that it is something that we very definitely should include, and I am glad that you both brought it up.

Of course, in terms of the traditional way in which money has funneled from Washington, which has been to the states, and it has been the states who had formed interstate compacts and had created regional activities, using "regional" as you define it. I would be interested in your reaction to the way in which money could flow from Washington that would be different. This is now in the development of a national network, in a national program that would be different from having it flow from Washington to the states.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I have no formula, Mr. Becker, other than to say that you have here -- well, I think our grant from the National Science Foundation is very obviously one, because obviously we are dealing with a classified, specific objective, tied in totally with the very thing that this Commission is concerned about, and they perhaps, as you know, have turned to this agency in the hope that a capacity to touch base with six states and to form a bridge between the official governments and the educational institutions post-secondary may accelerate the development of the activities with which they have already been engaged at separate campuses for the past year, because the pace of local development is too slow. No one who is concerned with these matters is going to live long enough to see anything of a network developed at the pace at which single grants or single state grants would operate. We don't know if we are going to be successful nor do the people in Washington, but if funds are flowed to the states -- and here is another problem in which perhaps our board is not directly concerned with the Commission's concerns -- there is clearly a dichotomy between public libraries and academic libraries. You talk of funds flowing to the states. My knowledge, which is admittedly limited, is that these funds that you are talking about are for funds for library development and I am talking about funds which relate to the development of independent,most often autonomous institutions of higher education which somehow must be developed into a network.

You have the same problem very obviously if you try to deal with 50 state library agencies, as we do when we deal with 250 libraries of higher institutions. I don't see how, as coming to a state government except as the federal, appropriating to us as a regional board, but then you have the problem existing of the library compact that has never been implemented, its activities lying there dormant, waiting for somebody to pump some life into it. It is ironic in a sense and it was not done with any forethought, that here an agency as general as yours, charged with all the improving academic facilities, should come along and be an actual implementer of an activity of all six states, whereas the compact lies dormant.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: I thought that the New England compact received no aid from the six states.

MR. FERGUSON: No, sir.

MR. LORENZ: I thought when the compact was --

MR. FERGUSON: Well, there is a board that has now, in the past year, been implemented, the New England Library Board; in terms of motivation, they certainly want to implement the compact, but the source of funds, as I understand it and know it, are federal funds which come to the states.

Now, as these dry up, which some have done recently, so dries up the New England Board.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Ferguson, in talking about this national program, which includes a network, cannot one make a distinction between the funding channels and authorities that receive the funds and the mechanisms and instrumentalities that are going to compose the network? They don't have to be exactly the same.

MR. FERGUSON: I think that is quite right, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think that is quite right.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any other questions?

Joe?

MR. BECKER: Just a comment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ferguson, I ran into another Commission in Washington called the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and they are very concerned with the whole notion of regional relationships to the federal structure. I don't know if you are familiar with that commission.

MR. FERGUSON: Somewhat.

MR. BECKER: But they are studying the local and financial consequences of a different pattern of financial relationship between the federal government and the groups of states. They are working with the Council on State Governments, with the League of Mayors and so forth.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I am familiar somewhat with that. We tried some years ago to institute a training program for public officers as middle management personnel working with local and state and county levels, and we were concerned about the enabling legislation for this commission. So we had looked somewhat into that.

MR. LORENZ: Are you aware that under the Higher Education Act, Title 2, that the center for research libraries in Chicago did receive, with the approval of participating libraries -- I wonder if you have tried this methodology for your board?

MR. FERGUSON: No, we have not. We are up to our ears in work at this juncture. We are only at the stage where we now have enough confidence to feel that we should in our capacities very deeply go into what we call informational science, and I would be very grateful for a definition of that phrase, but there is no doubt in our minds at least at the interstate activities, because of the economics of electronic transmission techniques for information delivery, the interstate activities are peculiarly amenable to a relationship here to the economics, because of the very large user market to support the activities, and there are very few states in New England -- perhaps Massachusetts and Connecticut would be marginal cases -- in my opinion which should do it all on a computerized basis. But even though it could not be usable because of the interstate cooperation, it is gratuitous perhaps, but the very disputable facts, all the informational science and all the various sciences, make the state boards absolutely ridiculous.

CHM. BURKHARDT: One last question.

MR. AINES: You asked a question actually of the Commission.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, sir.

MR. AINES: You also pointed out in the document that the federal government should provide leadership without dictation and support without creating a dependency. These are not necessarily two statements which can be tied together very easily.

MR. FERGUSON: I realize that.

MR. AINES: Those of you that are familiar with our history with the Chemical Abstract Service and the building of mechanized information capability should recognize now there are forces in the Office of Management and Budget which pretty much preclude anything that looks like support for the development of systems of this type. So the point that I have made here is that we here in the Commission are looking for legislation to provide a firmer foundation than perhaps research grants which may come and may go without any guarantee.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, I realize that and I appreciate that comment.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Ferguson.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Now we have a little opening which has been created by someone who is ill and I want to ask Mr. Lawrence Solomon if he is here. I simply could give you some time, Mr. Solomon, now, if you want to take it.

MR. SOLOMON: My name is Lawrence Solomon and I am the Director of the New Bedford, Massachusetts library, and I have spent some time today looking at the draft proposal of the Commission and I heard a lot of testimony, some of it about the detailed aspects which primarily affected a person who happens to have been reading it from their point of view. The main thing that struck me about the draft was that you opened the door, but then you closed or paused on the threshold and you did not go any further.

I think what I am telling you, ladies and gentlemen, is that you do not go far enough.

Perhaps if we consider that the major libraries in the country are not in any sense any more local libraries--you think of the Boston Public Library, the New York Public Library, the Chicago Public Library. These are in no way local libraries, they are dependent upon a wide community throughout the state and very often throughout the country for use of their collections.

In this sense, I think the major libraries of the country, both public and those in higher educational institutions, should be considered as a natural resource and should be relieved of their dependency on local funding; and perhaps if this Commission would consider a federal funding of the major libraries of the country, both public and those in higher education, on the basis that they are a natural resource and just as important as natural resources which we are now working very hard to conserve, and perhaps this support could be based on the basis of matching state funds and some other formula that would insure that they adhered to the demands of the area in which they were located. This financial support perhaps also to be contingent upon open access, participation and regional or national networks. You would then establish the basis that you have so ably presented in your draft, that you would have a national network and you would be involving leading libraries and the library leaders in the regional networks and a statewide network. You would then be able to capitalize upon existing regional networks, of which there are several, some more active than others, some needing some encouragement, some just waiting to do great things.

I would suggest, to insure that the regional networks adhere closely to the demands of the region, that somewhere along the line a regional council be invited into the act, perhaps in an advisory nature, which regional council would have representation to a national council which would act in the same capacity to whatever national and administrative body there was.

I have heard various proposals, and one of them that came over very strongly was that the Library of Congress be empowered to be the national coordinating and directing agency; and in line with their other activities in the library field, both in public, state and special libraries particularly, this would seem to fit in. The national advisory council, so set up, would be, I believe, advisory but have considerable political power because it would be based at the grass roots of the local and regional levels.

I would suggest that possibly the state and local funds thus realized could be used to set fairly high standards for local libraries, which would be necessary for them to participate in this regional network. You would then leave the way open for local support, participation, contributions, modifications and adaptations to suit local circumstances, and yet you would provide the avenue for strengthening of the regional networks and the communication of ideas and of information interiorly within the regional networks. And a network could be worked out among the regional councils and the library leaders of each area.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Solomon.

Is there any question from any member of the Commission?

end2 Since there are no questions, we will go

dow fls. on to our next speaker.

[Continued on following page.]

T-A
DOW/mef-1
Lib.
Conf.
fls.TF

CHM. BURKHARDT: This is Mr. David Weisbrod of the Yale University Library.

MR. WEISBROD: I would like to thank the Chairman and the Commission members for this opportunity to come before you. You have my written testimony and, of course, that is my personal view of some problem areas. It doesn't necessarily represent a monolithic, Yale or any other kind of affiliation-type view.

My orientation is rather technical, certainly in comparison with the testimony I have heard so far today.

I regret not having been able to read the draft report which did not arrive at my desk before I left to come here, so I will give you my comments in writing at a later time.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I wish you would.

MR. WEISBROD: I do have some additional concerns to bring before you. One is that I just had the opportunity to begin to read carefully a report which I trust the Commission has: "National Aspects of Creating and Using MARC/RECON Records." I assume you have it because there are a number of recommendations in it addressed to the Commission. I would like to say that I certainly agree with them; and as far as I have gotten in here, this is, I believe, essentially similar to or

Hemlock

complementary to the suggestions in my own written testimony.

I would like to just note that considerably less than one-half, probably less than a quarter of all machine-readable cataloging being created in the United States today is originating at the Library of Congress. The rest is taking place out in the field some place else, and there is a pressing need to get it all together, quite literally.

I see as necessary a series of evolutionary steps going toward a national bibliographic system of increased effectiveness; and perhaps as one step toward this -- that is, a first step before even any of these specified things in the MARC/RECON report -- would be a centralized MARC collection and dissemination function before the Library of Congress, although that certainly is not necessary, which would entail a trial processing at several distinct libraries of merged MARC tapes.

Now certainly this recommendation is magnetic tape oriented, even though I expect that the ultimate national bibliographic network will be linked by electronic communications links on at least one level. We will probably see this network exist on more than one level in the sense that there would be centrally produced hard copy; that is, books, microfilm, as well as electronic links. I don't expect the national union catalog as a printed document to disappear and be replaced by a network of wires. In that sense I am thinking of something like the National Library of Medicine which from the same data base produces both immediate hard copy and an immediate line retrievable system.

Earlier in the day we heard both Mr. Canham and Mr. Cuadra express some interest in the question Who Pays? and there was also alluded to the expectation on the part of some that the federal government should cover all costs. I believe that many librarians feel -- and I know that Yale does -- that they would be willing to pay real money to the Library of Congress to allow it to increase the portion of its cataloging output that is transcribed into machine-readable form. This would be actually not without precedent. The early PL 480 arrangement, I believe, called for participating libraries to participate toward the cost of the program.

Those are just a few rather disconnnected, additional comments to what I hope was a document that was somewhat more coherent. I would be happy now to answer your questions.

MR. CUADRA: Dave, you made a comment in your paper about multi-directional exchange of MARC records. Were you thinking of anything analogous to the

ERIC System where the cataloging is in some sense decentralized or shared among institutions, or what did you mean by "multi-directional"?

MR. WEISBROD: I'm not intimately familiar with the ERIC system but my impression is that it is kind of a delegated responsibility where it is known ahead of time that certain libraries are going to be covered by certain clearing houses. That is not what I had in mind. What I am thinking of basically in the back of my mind is a group of people who have been getting together informally with transportation paid by OCLC for such institutions as Stanford, Chicago, Washington State, all of which have operations either functioning now or about to begin functioning to put together a fair amount of bibliographic information into machine-readable form. Right now, except for private bilateral agrements, there is no way for any of these institutions to take advantage of the work being done at any of the others. It is this multi-lateral exchange that I have in mind.

The RECON report, of course, is oriented toward pouring it all into a funnel, some national-type funnel, and have it come out in an organized fashion as perhaps a supplementary MARC distribution service; if you will, a machine-readable NUC. And I certainly hope that that will come to pass ultimately because multi-lateral exchanges tend to be duplicative and expensive. Call it experimental, but "experimental" has a suggestion of that hypothesis and verification, a trial basis. I think it would be extremely useful to see either multi-lateral exchanges or a kind of unfiltered exchange such as I just described, which is merging with no attempt at laundering, as NUC does.

Just to see what individual libraries can do with each other's machine-readable cataloging, in that sense I am thinking of MARC pilot project as a model where we sent out tapes to 16 libraries to see what would come out.

There was a conference that Mr. Becker chaired, and there was a technical subcommittee that met in the course of that conference that was concerned not with the organizational or financial aspects but the technical aspect of putting it together. And many of us in that group felt that, if you will, competition was a good way to sort out the good ideas from the bad. It has to have more than one network. The BALLAST system looks like the LCL system. This is without praising either one or to demean either one. They are very different design concepts, looking at different goals, and it's only by trying them out and seeing what users use that you have an idea as to what really is important to give.

Now it may be possible for someone to plan a series of coordinated trials. Then one can note that between the fall of 1967 and now, space exploration has taken place with a series of intermediate steps coming along. We didn't send a man to the moon first off. We had to develop a number of stepping stone-type of technological plateaus, many of which represented, if you will, a duplicate of design, competitive approaches, some of which were then wasteful and some of which were not. But I certainly would not have liked to be the first guy going to the moon if there hadn't been an Apollo program before that, and I don't think we ought to do that to libraries either.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Becker and then Mr. Lerner.

MR. BECKER: Dave, as you know, there are diverse ways in which bibliographic data is being placed into machine-readable form today. Washington State has chosen to go straight down the MARC path and do it exactly the way the Library of Congress does. OCLC has departed from MARC to a certain degree. The UKUK cataloging, CALAN-1 up in Canada have been modifications of MARC but have not hit it right on the head.

There has been expressed both in your informal meetings and elsewhere the need to somehow or other settle on one way to go because it is going to be of benefit not only to the organizations that are involved in it now but everyone else, the aim being to increase the critical mass of machine-readable data that the nation possesses. This takes enforcing. That is the enforcement of a standard. There is no body at the present time, administrative body, responsible for doing this. In the interim, what are the possible ways of avoiding going down different paths and of making certain that we stay on a single track for the benefit of all? Have you any wise words on that subject?

MR. WEISBROD: Not very many. That problem certainly existed before the invention of computers. The problem of whose submission to the National Union Catalog looked nice and whose don't I am sure existed before. But the computer does make the problem more intense.

We do have one model of a solution and that is in the Ohio College Library Center where peer group pressure seems to be a very strong force, without naming names. There was one library that had very conscientiously taken what we call a maverick approach toward completeness of bibliographic records, which after enough hammering away, reversed its position. I do not know whether the membership of the Ohio College Library Center would have kicked that library out ultimately. I am pleased to say it didn't come to that. And I would hope that that kind of mechanism would tend to be the operant one. That is in terms of the enforcement question.

In terms of the standards question; that is, What are you trying to enforce? This report again distinguishes that that depends largely on what function you are trying to perform. The NUC function is different from the shared cataloging or cataloging promulgation function since, for example, NUC is not subject-oriented, with the exception of LC's own input. And this is the kind of thing where the trials are important, because there is no clairvoyant librarian that I know of -- that we can admit into the "national data base" whatever that may turn out to be -- with records of varying degrees of completeness.

In terms of the record structure, there exists in a de facto standard, the LC MARC standard. I call it de facto because it is not promulgated by the American Library Association. But it certainly is there and very much controlling what goes on.

And in terms of deciding what elements shall be designated by what codes, how those elements shall be defined is fairly well established now, although I expect some evolutionary change will develop as we gain more experience.

MR. LERNER: I am surprised to see as one of the major technical problems the production of multi-font displays and hard and soft copy. Why is that a major problem? I would think that point size or size of copy would be more meaningful, and I do know that there are machines which can in fact produce multi-font displays with a number of types of input.

MR. WEISBROD: I am not an expert in this field, but certainly most computer line printers would not have a character repertoire at a single moment in time without changing the print train to both the Roman alphabet and serillac. You have to go to a fairly sophisticated typesetting device for you to get that.

MR. LERNER: I know of the Harris 2200 or various machines like that which could do it.

MR. WEISBROD: You are not going to have either one of those with a local terminal in every library; are you?

MR. LORENZ: Some months ago, Dave, we heard about the embryonic research libraries, a new kind of consortium of New York, Yale, Harvard, Columbia, I believe.

MR. WEISBROD: Yes.

MR. LORENZ: Is it too early to say what might be developing among this group that might have significance for a national network plan?

MR. WEISBROD: Since I am not designated an official spokesman of that, I would rather avoid that question, except that I will report that a planning study is presently under way. It is a three-month planning study which began on July 15. We expect it to terminate on the 15th of this month. The chief planner is Joe Rosenthal who is the associate librarian at UC Berkeley, and it is hoped that about a month after the planning study is over, he will have a report for the four librarians, and I cannot try to second-guess what is going to be in that report.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Any further questions?

MS. WU: Would you suggest that in the future when the federal government is funding the libraries, will you consider the policy in your first paragraph? You have it down as the poverty problem. Would you consider the poverty area the first priority to get the funding or to give more money to the poverty area?

MR. WEISBROD: I would like to dodge that question. You are asking about poverty; is that correct?

MS. WU: You have the poverty problem here.

MR. WEISBROD: I was referring just to the general area of cutback of funds for libraries. I wasn't referring to the depressed areas. I realize that there are many aspects of the national problem of libraries and library priorities, and I would defer to the wisdom of the Commission and not try to suggest any priorities of my own.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mr. Weisbrod. I appreciate your coming from New Haven.

Mr. Locke?

[No response.]

Mr. Locke is not here.

How about Mr. Laucus? Not here? Yes, there he is.

MR. LAUCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Earlier today the question was asked What are the needs and wants of the library user and what does he deserve? In my experience, what a user wants when he comes to a library is a specific piece of information in book or other form. A user's wants are generally immediate. He wants his information or his book right now. The user's need for the information is generated by some force. In a personal situation, this may be a self-generated internal force: the desire for educational self-enrichment, or it may be an external force; for example, the pressures of the best-seller lists or of the Today Show to read a book while it's still new.

In a working situation, whether the work done is profit oriented or scholarly, the user needs the information in book or other form for the completion of some task. In an academic situation, whether it be at the elementary school level or at the doctoral school level, he needs the information because he has been required in one way or another to get the information.

What the library user deserves, I think, is a library system which will provide some guarantee of satisfaction of his needs, a system in which someone, somehwere, will identify, collect, catalog, preserve and give access somehow to information which will be needed either at present or in the future.

No library can provide guarantees to satisfy a user's wants on an immediate basis either because it does not own the information which the user is seeking or because the piece containing the information has been preempted by another user. No library, even one with an encyclopedic collection, can afford to acquire or house every piece of information potentially useful to every member of its direct community, as the Commission's draft report points out.

Hemlock
ERASABLE

Further, if I have the library's only copy of the book, you can't have it right now, and the Commission can do nothing about that.

This inability to satisfy user wants immediately is unfortunate, partially because in many cases the library's users are also the library's financiers, taxpayers, academic administrators or business executives.

Two points made earlier today: First, that many large research libraries do not know what they have in their own collections. I agree with that point and would expand it by saying that many small working libraries do not know what they have in their own collection. The phenomenon of the incomplete catalog and the phenomenon of the cataloging backlog are, unfortunately, far too common.

The second point was that librarians, faced with handling increasing masses of materials, tend to think in mechanical terms. I agree with that point also, but I would modify it by adding that librarians tend to think mechanically so that they can make information available to human users as quickly as they can.

The potential functions of the Library of Congress as mentioned in the Commission's draft -- among these, expanding machine-readable cataloging, expanding the MARC data base retrospectively, distributing bibliographic *data on line, expanding the work done on serials* -- shows that the Commission recognizes the need to think mechanically for the human purpose of getting the information to the user and freeing librarians in the field for other service activities.

The question was asked this morning about the pitfalls in establishing inter-institutional cooperation. One major pitfall which was mentioned is in the attitudes of the librarians considering cooperation: the fear of change, fear of loss of autonomy.

I think another major pitfall is in the attitudes of the users whom librarians are trying to serve through cooperation. I quote from a non-scholarly periodical, Esquire, an interview with the founder of one of the term paper factories:

> "I started Term Papers Unlimited when I had a paper to write and ran all over Boston looking for books. Do you know how many libraries there are in Boston? I was struck by the inefficiency of the process. For six hours of reading, I had to spend three days on the MTA. So I figured if a student could hire someone to do the research, he could save himself a lot of time. Students have a lot to do and are

not going to learn anything running from one library to another, looking for a bunch of books, half of which will be charged out or missing anyway.

"Last year the presidents of half a dozen colleges here in the Boston area met to discuss what to do about the term paper problem, by which they meant me. Now these are college presidents who have 50,000 students on their sidewalks ready to burn down the libraries, and they never got together before. So if they are getting together now, they must be in a panic."

I would point out that for a network of any type to succeed, the users have to believe in it. Library users and library financiers are going to have to continue putting time into getting their books and their information, and they are going to have to realize that no matter how effective an information network or a lending service is established at whatever high cost, they will have to wait. Their wants to get their information now likely will not be satisfied, although their needs for the information through a system hopefully will be. Any survey in any educative process which this Commission undertakes will have to make library users and library financiers realize this. I think that librarians deserve that. Thank you.

MS. MOORE: Are there questions?

MR. STEVENS: John, I would like to go back to the first point you mentioned, the idea of what the user wants, and I know you spoke to it from what you said you observed in your academic community.

I wonder if from that observation point you could speak to the idea of our understanding better what the user needs for information when the user himself can't define his problem or can't define his needs -- and that I know happens on the academic campus as well as it does off the academic campus -- and what the library can do about helping the user to define his needs. Are we really in the business of some rudimentary effort, remedial effort with the user in order to help define those needs so that in turn we can fulfill his desires and create a library situation in which he achieves what he wants through a system?

MR. LAUCUS: Yes. The concept of the reference interview, as I learned it in library school, being done by librarians with students, with library users, prior to the user's appearing in the library is feasible, and I think this can be done and is being done in some academic libraries.

I know that our own reference people are spending time with incoming freshmen, trying to educate them on the use of libraries.

MR. STEVENS: The reference interview, then, is being used in teaching the user how to ask a question. Is that the key?

MR. LAUCUS: Even prior to his appearing as a questioner. That is the reference interview without a reference question.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

MS. MOORE: Are there other questions?

MR. LORENZ: Just as a point of information, I am glad to report to you that the cataloging and publication program is now going forward with appropriated funds. The Library of Congress usually uses grant funds for study and research development phases and then beyond that goes for appropriated funds, and we were successful in the cataloging and publication program in using that cycle.

MR. LAUCUS: Thank you.

MS. MOORE: Thank you very much, sir, for your testimony, and we invite your continued interest in the program.

I believe Mr. William Locke has come in. We are ready now to hear his testimony. He is from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MR. LOCKE: Thank you very much.

It was my understanding that you wanted to ask me questions and that I was not to read my testimony. Do you wish to have me read aloud --

MS. MOORE: That is not necessary. We have all read it, I am sure. Do you have anything you would like to add to your statement?

MR. LOCKE: I might comment briefly on the draft statement which I received in the mail the other day, if you would like. I will not make editorial comments, but I would be glad to hand a copy of the draft with some editorial comments on it to any appropriate person. I will only make more general comments.

MS. MOORE: If you will hand that to our Chairman, Dr. Burkhardt.

MR. LOCKE: As you can see from my rapid turning of pages, I have very little to add. On Page 5, however, there is one comment that I would like to make. In the middle of the page at the end of the second paragraph there is the statement:

"However, others are already experimenting with inter-active computer time-sharing networks for data retrieval, and still others are investigating future use of electronic communications for the routing of whole books and documents from one place to another as an alternative to mail."

I think this, at present cost, is expensive. If you can get free communications networks, it won't be. But it will be time-consuming with present technology. It take a long time to send an 8 1/2 by 11 page over telephone wires. You would have to have microwave lengths, and this is very expensive. But, of course, if somebody else pays for it, it's fine. I have some information on that subject in an article that I wrote, "Computer Cost for Large Libraries" which I am sure is available to the committee. I have a copy here if you would like.

Now on Page 8, as a further comment I would like to suggest -- excuse me.

MS. MOORE: Go right ahead, sir. We were just trying to locate something up here. Just go right ahead.

MR. LOCKE: Is this the appropriate time and place to be making these comments?

MS. MOORE: Yes.

MR. LOCKE: All right. I would like to suggest delection of the second paragraph on Page 8. I think it's incomplete, and I think the last sentence is wrong. I see no reason to believe that we have more knowledge in data within our own borders than any other country. I suggest that this is an unnecessary insult to other countries.

On Page 10 under "Organization," perhaps I will just read the note that I have written at the bottom of Page 10:

> "Whatever solution is found, short of putting this (and "this" is the new operating organization) in the legislative branch, which would be wrong, there will be a building conflict of interest between this organization and the Library of Congress. See Page 13."

And that refers simply to Page 13, which is the role of the Library of Congress. My statement bears on [illegible]t topic.

On Page 12 I believe there is a conflict in two statements, between two statements on Page 12, the first sentence on the page and the second indented paragraph below on the page.

The first sentence says that the Federal Government would fund those aspects of the program of common concern nationally, et cetera, and the local libraries would -- excuse me, the States would fund libraries within their own jurisdictions.

The second indented paragraph below on the page says financing the State share of its obligation to the national program and State library development according to formulas which take the entire state population into account.

Perhaps there is no conflict, but it seems to me possible that there is there.

T-B

I also would suggest that if in that second indented paragraph the formulas that are needed are weighted formulas, to take into account the type of population distribution within the State. If you have different ethnic groups, if you have industrial versus agricultural states, the needs obviously are very different in the different states.

That ends my substantive comments on the draft, but I would like very much to transmit to you my editorial comments which are one or two per page; and for a draft, that is really very good. I think the draft statement is excellent, and I would certainly support it.

MS. MOORE: If you would send your comments to Dr. Burkhardt. Oh, he is now back in the room.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I am sorry I had to be out of the room when you testified. I got a phone call from Washington. But I do want to ask you to go over that document rather carefully and give us any other comments or suggestions or ideas that come to you. We would be very glad to have them.

MR. LOCKE: Well, I have done that, and I am prepared now, if you like,to hand you this draft, or I can mail it to you, if you prefer.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mail it to us.

MR. LOCKE: I will be glad to.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You sent us some testimony in advance.

MR. LOCKE: I did.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have a rather, shall I say, atypical view of the Library of Congress as far as we have heard, at any rate, and I think you raise a number of questions in it. If I understood it correctly, you are saying the LC is not now a national library or certainly not **the** national library in any de facto sense and that a lot has to be done in order to make it **the** national library, which I guess on that part we would agree pretty well. But you are concerned about whether it should be made the central bibliographical reference place for the country

Corrasable
ERASABLE

and various other functions that we would think of as being done by a national library if we were ever to have one.

I would like very much to have Mr. Lorenz, who must have reacted very definitely to what you had to say, put some questions to you and perhaps have a little controversy going.

MR. LORENZ: I don't want to get into a controversy, but I would say that from my direct knowledge, Bill, you have grossly underestimated the amount of co-ordination and communication and cooperation between the Library of Congress and the other libraries of the country. I think there is practically no program that we plan or develop in which we do not have extensive discussions with the major libraries and librarians of the country, particularly through the Association for Research Libraries. And I would say the development of standards, for example, this is certainly true, in which we work very closely with the American Library Association as well.

And in terms of some of our most significant programs which we have planned cooperatively, I would say the national program for preservation and catalogoing has almost unanimous support of the libraries of the country. The cataloging and publication program to which you refer is now not only being tried but is an ongoing program with Congressional appropriations and making great strides. And in terms of the preservation program, our funds that we are getting from the Congress for preservation purposes have increased remarkably over the past ten years. So I think you have just generally underestimated what the Library of Congress is doing and hopes to do more of in the future.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Would you not also say that in one sense at least it is an exaggeration to say, as I think you do, that the services to Congress has the priority? Of course the legislative reference service has a priority and it is the Library of Congress in that sense and very much so, but one cannot say that as far as its budget is concerned and all of that, that Congress puts the largest sum of money in for that service. I think in toto the legislative reference service is what percent of your budget?

MR. LORENZ: Less than 10 percent.

CHM. BURKHARDT: All the other things are MARC and various services that go further than the Congress or even the government; right?

MR. LORENZ: Yes, of course.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, I want you to respond to these things. If you think we have got it wrong, we would like to know.

MR. LOCKE: I understand John's position. John has a job to do, and he couldn't very well take any other position even if he thought differently. But don't think that I think he thinks differently, because I am sure he doesn't.

Nevertheless, it would hardly be possible for a member of the staff of the Library of Congress to come here and agree with what I am saying. This is a very uncomfortable position for me to be in. I realized in writing that document that it would not be popular among my friends on the staff of the Library of Congress or many of the former employees.

MR. DUNLAP: Former friends.

[Laughter]

MR. LOCKE: With some of my former friends on the staff of the Library of Congress or other places.

I, however, reflected a long time before writing that paper, and I would be happy to hear any further objections, but I remain unconvinced that my position is wrong. For one thing, there is a very -- could I just have one more sentence? There is one very fundamental consideration that bothers me here. It is so trite that I hesitate to raise it and yet trite things are often trite because they are true.

No man can serve two masters. As far as I am concerned, the Library of Congress should be -- excuse me, the National Library should be either a national library or the Library of Congress in name, not both, and it should see its role as a national library that is responsible to the nation, not through Congress, I believe, but through the libraries and the National Library system, because the libraries of the country are the agents of the users of libraries, and the national library should be the agent of those agents. It should be an agent directly responsive to the needs of the users of the libraries, not filtered through the members of Congress who have too many irons in the fire, too many things to specialize in any one thing.

The library profession is a very complex and difficult one. I was only 15 years in it, and many people would think I didn't learn nearly enough in 15 years. I think so, too. Nevertheless, I am aware of the difficulty and complexity of it. But I do feel very, very strongly that it will not do to have Congress holding the purse strings for this directly, particularly if the name is still Library of Congress. This is a very bad situation. If the name disappears and it is called the National Library, then it will be better.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Congress holds the purse strings on everything.

MR. LOCKE: I realize that very well, but the administrative departments are a lot freer than the legislative, freer of direct control than the legislative departments.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I don't want to get into an argument with you. We have a number of people who also want to question you. Mr. Dunlap and Ms. Scott.

MS. SCOTT: Yes. My concern was about your statement on the preservation of deteriorating books. John has spoken to it. What further would you recommend that the Library of Congress could do beyond the program they already have in effect? I am with the Smithsonian Institution. We also have an interest in preservation.

MR. LOCKE: Yes. What I am concerned about is that it has taken so long to get the program started, and there isn't any visible sign yet of a program which was planned very carefully years ago and which may now be rolling; but like many things done in the world, they take a long, long time. And one frequently wonders why they take so long, whether it is a lack of interest or whether -- lack of money but which reflects a lack of interest or whether it is a matter of priority. I don't know what the cause is, but I do know that there were definite promises made many years ago -- and

I stated the date and I can't remember it -- and these promises were repeated in similar form a good many years later after ARL had set up a new committee and restudied the whole question. I suppose this new committee and restudy was necessary, because nothing had happened during the interim of a number of years. And I just wonder whether it is going to happen again.

MR. DUNLAP: I had one minor point. I appreciate your right to say what you think, Bill, about the Library of Congress. I happen to disagree with you. I think they do a very splendid job.

MR. LOCKE: I hope you read the second page of my statement. I think they do a very good job, too.

MR. DUNLAP: I am a former staff member and worked on some of the things they have done. I worked for some years in the manuscripts division, and the Library of Congress certainly deserves credit for many things. They didn't do it alone but spearheaded it and provided the style necessary for the prescribed manuscript collections, and they got the job done.

One little editorial note on your statement on Page 2 where you say as LC has grown bigger, it has grown unwieldy.

The Center for Research Libraries had to be set up to handle storage and loans of uncommon books. I would submit that this is not historical. MILC, the predecessor of CRL, was set up by the presidents of about a dozen mid-West universities primarily as a depository library.

MR. LOCKE: Yes, but I didn't refer to MILC. I referred to the Center for Research Libraries. I think its function is now quite different, and it is being taken over by ARL because it has a different function. It no longer serves only the mid-West library area.

MR. DUNLAP: The MILC was transformed into CRL but not with regard to CBT unyielding the function at LC.

MR. LOCKE: I have heard such criticisms of the inability of the Library of Congress to provide inter-library loans; that LC does not handle foreign theses any more; that they have all been moved to the mid-West inter-library center. This to me is an important area because I have been in an academic library. LC doesn't have a lot of the journals which are in CRL.

Little by little it seems to me CRL is taking on a number of functions that would belong in a national library.

MR. DUNLAP: I don't deny it has taken on some of these, but you state that CRL had to be set up to handle some of the things that it is now doing because LC had grown to be unwieldy. I just dispute that.

MR. LOCKE: I think it was an unfortunate way of presenting it. Perhaps I have clarified my opinion in this discussion.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lerner and then Mr. Aines.

MR. LERNER: I think Mr. Locke has one point that I think that we have all been overlooking, and that is that the process by which the Library of Congress becomes anything is a legislative process and a political process, and it seems to me that we have not thought through the politics, quote-unquote, of all of this before we move any further. That is my only comment.

MR. AINES: I don't know whether I am trying to get you off the hook or not in my question to you, but in your last statement you talk about with the help of the Commission, the research libraries of the country will have to lead in planning and executing a solution, a solution dealing with bibliographic control. How realistic do you think this is?

MR. LOCKE: This may or may not be realistic, but I feel that the research libraries of the country and the Library of Congress have been convinced for many years of the need for better, more complete bibliographic control. It is impossible, I would say, to be in the library business and not realize how central this is to the operation of any library or information facility of any kind.

One of your big problems is to know what is being published and where you can get it. So the research libraries are very eager to assist in anything that can be done to improve bibliographic control and access. I did not mention access but, of course, that follows on: As soon as you have got the control, then you need the access.

So that is why I feel that the research library should be called upon even more than they are to work with not only LC -- and I haven't mentioned the two national libraries but I would like to, because we have two national libraries, and I was particularly offended by this use of the term **the** national library when we have two which are outstanding, particularly the Medical Library. I think the National Library of Medicine has done some extraordinary work which LC could have pioneered in, I think, and perhaps not.

Incidentally, the National Medical Library is an example of the sort of relationship I would like to see between the other national library, if you will, the third national library, and the professional groups and the users of the country. The reason the National Medical Library has been successful is that its very close working relationship between itself and the medical libraries of the country and the doctors of the country.

Now I am posing, I think, an extremely difficult and perhaps an impossible task for any national library to have this sort of close working contact with all the other professional groups, except agriculture, of the country. Yet this is the real way to get understanding of user needs and user support, which means money to run an information service in libraries.

CHM. BURKHARDT: On your point about consulting the research libraries, you are no doubt aware of the report on research libraries that was made by this ACLS Committee for the Advisory Commission on Libraries. This committee was composed almost entirely of research librarians, and their recommendation was to turn the Library of Congress into a genuine national library, calling it, The Library of Congress, the National Library of the United States, and then adding functions and all that sort of thing to it. But the research librarians did not go so far as to recommend the sort of status that you are recommending, possibly because they felt it was unrealistic.

MR. LOCKE: It may be unrealistic, but I thought --

CHM. BURKHARDT: They had been asked for their opinion and their planning, and their planning is there. I am sorry to say that the report is now seven years old an nothing much has happened to the recommendations, but neve - theless they are in the picture.

MR. LOCKE: It is difficult for the Association of Research Libraries to make any recommendation which would make the Library of Congress unhappy because the Library of Congress is a member and is well represented by former staff members.

I might say to me one of the most strikingly, one of the most striking successes of the Library of Congress -- I have noticed this ever since I have been in the library business -- is the loyalty of former employees.

MS. MOORE: I was a member of the old Advisory Commission, and I recall this argument going on in that Commission about our recommendation. It was not because of any fault we found with the Library of Congress at that time or now, but in discussing it then, we were concerned about the pride of Congress in the Library and that they would not take kindly to it being a national library, and that is something that hasn't been brought out today.

MR. LOCKE: That is part of my point. That is why I think that unless it becomes a national library and is at least called the Library of Congress, the traditions are going to be too strong.

You see, I feel the working relationship between the national library and the Association -- or not the Association but perhaps the research libraries, probably the Association of Research Libraries, should be a working relation not of the superior to the inferiors, which it is today in many ways. The Library of Congress in many ways calls the tune. I often feel that consulting ARL is a formality; that decisions are made first -- and I am going way out on a limb now, and I am sure people from LC would like to argue on many matters where this is undoubtedly true -- nevertheless, there is always a feeling that I feel in meetings of ARL that when the Library of Congress speaks, everyone is careful what they say because, obviously, LC is a very important, very large organization.

This should not be the relationship between the national library and the major research libraries of the country. There should be a relationship of equality there. They should meet on a footing of equality in order that the best ideas can be put into effect.

MR. CUADRA: I don't think you are the type that is cowed by having atypical views, but I would just remind everyone that the young fellow who pointed out that the Emperor's new clothes were somewhat different than had been perceived also had an atypical view. I think the questions you have raised are very legitimate and cannot be evaded and I hope that this Commission will be able to push for some answers on it.

MR. LORENZ: I would like to clarify for a moment what Ms. Moore said in terms of Congress' attitude toward the Library of Congress. Since nine-tenths of what they appropriate for the Library of Congress is for national library services, I think that you should understand that most of their pride in the Library of Congress is in terms of its national library services and not what they derive from the Library themselves in terms of their own reference and research services.

I think, too, that in terms of the preservation program, Bill, that I hope you are reading our most recent annual reports because these do reflect the tremendous strides that we have taken in the preservation field. We now have a laboratory of over 30 people doing research and development in this area and a large restoration program. So I hope you are keeping up to date with what is going on.

MR. LOCKE: There is a little difference in definition of terms here between what you are saying and what I was saying. I wasn't referring to restoration but to a program which was recommended by ARL twice after very careful study including many specialists on how to preserve single copies of rare and disappearing books, books that are falling apart.

Could I take a moment to answer Carlos Cuadra's very kind comment? As I said earlier, I wrote this report with considerable trepidation because it is never easy to take an unpopular view, particularly if one feels he may be called upon to support it before a group of people. And I realized full well that I was letting myself open to criticism, public criticism. On the other hand, I did feel that it was desirable that this view be presented, and I would not have presented it if other librarians had not taken with me in discussion similar positions. I am sorry if it has not happened that anyone of this persuasion among the library community has testified before you. If so, I am sorry that I, like the boy who saw the Emperor's no-clothes situation, I am sorry to be a minority of one. But what Carlos has said makes me happy that I wrote down what I had in mind and presented it to you.

Thank you very much, Carlos.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much, Mr. Locke, dow/mef-37

and I hope, as I said earlier, that you will send us your comments on the national plan.

MR. LOCKE: With pleasure.

end dow

tf fls.

[Continued on following page.]

T15 CHM. BURKHARDT: We next are to hear from Mr. Wolfgang N. Freitag.

MR. FREITAG: Thank you.

CHM. BURKHARDT: You have been waiting for a long time.

MR. FREITAG: Yes. It has been a real education for me.

CHM. BURKHARDT: I hope you have not been too bored.

MR. FREITAG: Not at all. For someone who occupies a somewhat secluded niche in librarianship, this has certainly thrown me back into the mainstream and I am very grateful for the opportunity to explain some of the points that I raised in my written testimony and their meaning.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Let us first identify you. You are the Librarian of the Fine Arts Library and lecturer on fine arts at the Fine Arts Library of Cambridge?

MR. FREITAG: Not Cambridge, Harvard University, and that is a point to which I will come in the course of my testimony. I will not repeat anything that I have said in the paper, but I will just emphasize one or two points.

While most of the speakers today were chiefly concerned with the role of the library as a social agency, which I think should have the chief consideration of the Commission also, mine was a rather esoteric topic, namely, the typical special research library as a worthy candidate to become the central regional library for a given subject, in my case, the visual arts. And in my opinion, the visual arts lend themselves particularly to the brief incorporation into a regional network because, unlike science and technology or medicine, the visual data that we are the custodians of do not lend themselves to electronic transmission, at least not for research purposes, to the degree to which medical and technological data can be incorporated.

So while I want to commend you on the realization so convincingly expressed on page 4 of your proposal, namely, that a national network involves the co-joining of general and specialized libraries and information centers -- to which I say "Amen" -- I do see some problems in there with regard to the visual arts and with regard to research libraries in particular.

The problem that exists in the co-joining of libraries of that different financial basis in my mind is a real question of how does one overcome this danger of splintered efforts in a country that has chiefly money-endowed private and public library information systems.

The private are, as I said, either endowed universities and colleges, some so-called public libraries, like the research wing of the New York Public is endowed and then we have other cultural agencies which are endowed, such as museums or corporate industrial libraries of which Mr. Huleatt spoke in his own field of engineering and the public sector, namely, the public houses and universities, the public museums as well as state and municipal agencies.

This, I think,is a problem area and I don't have the answer to this.

Another point that concerns me very much I have alluded to on page 5 of my letter, and I am surprised that none of the other speakers from academic libraries has zeroed in on this problem, and this is the lack of support in collection-building, that is, in the emphasis on special areas of scholarship or knowledge that academic libraries should do in which they have not been supported by and large by the people who hold the purse strings of the institutions.

As I sit here, I quote myself: "In this country, librarians, much more than any other professional group in academia, have been willing to work together to share and to experiment. On the whole, they have done much more than the universities themselves toward pooling resources and sharing them as well as their responsibilities. Unfortunately, their best efforts have all too often been thwarted by university deans and academic vice-presidents. Deans and department chairmen love to start new programs of instruction and research for which their own libraries are utterly unprepared, while the library perhaps a hundred or two hundred miles away may have all the resources to support that particular program. These conditions are often the result of a star system of faculty recruiting and competition no longer justified in my opinion in terms of the financial situation most colleges and universities are in today, in the predictable increase in enrollment, in building up strong programs in overlapping or building up identical fields."

Cooperative book selection and the establishment of grants for special fields within a larger area of the visual arts would help prevent such occurrences in the future. This is another problem area to which I have no answer, but which I think such answer should be sought in the deliberations of the National Commission.

Still another area to which I have only alluded very slightly but which I have only sketched and which needs some flushing out here, and this is where the raison d'etre of the special library as a resource center, as so designated in any network, would come in -- is the need to collect and preserve intensively what I could call the "drain" media of publications, and by this I mean individual arts, but there are other subject areas which have the same problem; the media print may be bibliographically not fully described in items such as museum bulletins, flyers put out by museums, the hand lists that they give to people who enter certain galleries so that they can find their way through a sequence of rooms, the show and exhibit invitations from small museums and commercial galleries as well -- seriously neglected, for instance, except in a very haphazard way in the building up of dossiers of living artists, people who have one show, maybe no more than this one show; others who gain fame and have to be watched, or the little announcements have to be collected and preserved toward the day when you can deliver these people so to speak, to the discipline of artistry for further treatment, that is, until the first monograph is published.

This activity cannot be done by the national libraries; it cannot be done by the large research libraries. As an example on here, again I do not want to defend the representatives of the Library of Congress. They have not succeeded, for instance, in cataloging so well as the bibliographical and iconographical interests of the profession of art scholarship demanded, the exhibition and auction sales catalogs with the four research libraries compact threatening or maybe weakening -- I don't know.

In my institution we are going to be forced to accept,even more than we have up to now, the cataloging of these materials by the Library of Congress. Whereas, for instance, all the large,independent museum art research libraries have steadfastly neglected to adopt the Anglo-American code at least for the main entry. I don't want to go into details, but it is the question of main entry that is important here.

A real hope is, for instance, the capability of some of the network computers, such as OCLC to print information, catalog with regard to information out in different formats. I think that is a real possibility with which special libraries might be able to utilize the pre-packaged catalog information and still adhere to their own principles of entry.

This is all I have to say. It is obvious, of course, that all the visual resources are also a category that are very much on our mind. By this I mean naturally photographic archives. We have special problems of preservation, of conservation, slides and films, and now, of course, also video tapes. So I would like to suggest that the National Commission should in all its work make sure -- we look with great expectations to them -- but they should make sure that any cooperative assistance or systems or national systems are not counterproductive in terms of the needs of individual segments of the scholarly community.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Lou Lerner.

MR. LERNER: Mr. Freitag, you do not mention in your paper, nor did you just now, what I would call the clearinghouse function of the physical cataloging of works of art. Does that exist today? And, if so, in what form?

MR. FREITAG: Well, this is another area in which library documentation joins with the discipline of what has been called in Europe museography or archeography and the description of individual works of art in the museum collections with the aid of computers. The ideal system would consist indeed of a network of registrars' files of museums where you would have, in addition to the description, the museum-like description of the work of art, also references to the literature that deals with that piece, so the library documentation would be joined to the museum documentation. This has been the goal of the museum computer network that was started six years ago and which still exists. Although funding has been decreased, that has been the ultimate goal, because what basically art libraries are -- I mean to repeat a truism -- is they create the museum without walls, they extend the range of your galleries and your collections.

MS. SCOTT: You speak of two collections here under the National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery. The Archives in American Art is located and served by that library. You say that they should be in the collecting oral history program?

MR. FREITAG: Yes.

MS. SCOTT: They are now.

MR. FREITAG: They are doing that, yes.

MS. SCOTT: They are not being cataloged, however.

MR. FREITAG: Well, it should be.

MS. SCOTT: Or not made available.

MR. FREITAG: No. I think all I am making is a plea for funding, for more support. I think they are doing exactly the right thing for American art, and there is also one concept in the Archives of American Art operation which could be adopted by other documentation enterprises that are not too voluminous. I think that is a consideration, but the main collection is indeed housed but not part of the National Portrait Gallery, although both are bureaus of the Smithsonian Institution, and a complete copy on microfilm of that Archives in Washington, D. C. is available in the other four regional centers, one of which is in Boston and one is in San Francisco. The other one is in Detroit, which was the birthplace of the Archives of American Art. There will be one in San Francisco very shortly and it may exist now; I don't know. There will be one in New Orleans, but that is a very important effort inthis field.

MS. SCOTT: Would you like to extend your remarks on the National Gallery of Art? You dubbed it the "National Art Gal-Library." Do you see anything significant there? I mean any particular role?

MR. FREITAG: No. I think it is too early to say. I can only remind you that the library of the Victoria-Albert Museum was conceived as the National Art Library of London. I know it was conceived that way, but I know when the Advanced Study and Research Center for Visual Arts at the building of the National Gallery opened, there was talk about their making it the National Art Library, even by transfer of collections from the London gallery.

MR. DUNLAP: I was interested in reading in your paper the paragraph pertaining to the Archives of American Art. It was new to me. I wonder why you argue that the Archives of American Art should be the official repository for all letters, diaries and business records of all American artists, et cetera. I think it is important that the papers be preserved, and more often than not in the locale with which a man is associated. I see there is no repository between Detroit and San Francisco, and I would rather hope that Thomas Hart Benton's papers would be in Missouri.

MR.FREITAG: Well, I probably didn't express myself clearly enough. If there is a microfilm copy in the national center, that would certainly suffice.

MR. DUNLAP: You say "should be the official repository."

MR. FREITAG: Oh, I think it should be open to receive any additional material and I think it should also prevent too restrictive a policy on the part of some of the owners of the original material, because right now the catalog which has just been published through the resources of the Archives of American Art belongs to a number of collections that are known to exist through the Archives of American Art but which cannot be described in depth because they are restrictive in their policies.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Lorenz.

MR. LORENZ: I understand there have been discussions, if [illegible] a decision made, to turn the art catalogs at the Library of Congress over to the National Gallery of Art Library. Have you heard about this?

MR. FREITAG: No, I have not, sir, but I think that would be a very good move. I have suggested in the process that they be collected at the Center for Research Library or that the exhibition catalog should be centered at the National Gallery and the sales and auction catalogs at the Center for Research articles because those are not of interest to just the historian but to the economists as well.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Velde.

MR. VELDE: I was wondering if you had any problems too with no tax exemptions for papers.

MR. FREITAG: My library does not collect manuscript archives. We do have at the Archives one diary of an American painter, two legacies of art scholars, but those have landed in my lap more or less by default because these gentlemen are either former members of the Harvard faculty,in which case their writings would have gone into the university archives, or they were directors of the Fogg Museum, in which case their writings would have gone into the archives of the Fogg Museum. Nevertheless they were given to Harvard and I have them, but I am not adding to them.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Freitag.

We will now have as our final witness or witnesses Mr. Marvin Gechman and Mr. Edward Housman. We have a team presentation. Mr. Gechman is president of Information General, Incorporated in Needham; and Mr. Housman is the head of the information services of the GTE Laboratories, Inc. in Waltham, Mass.

Have you decided how to go about presenting your case here, or do you want to go into the question period right away?

MR. GECHMAN: I am older, so I will go first. We have really nothing to add to the paper directly, other than a desire to expand upon it in more detail, because the mechanism by which one goes about providing services to remote users is rather involved and our paper was just an overview. The only comment or the only thought that I have -- Ed might have additional -- is the relationship to the paper, of our paper to the statement which we read this afternoon. By and large, the ultimate goal of what we wrote about is identical to the draft of your program, and the only place where there is a difference is in the methods by which you get there.

There is a distinct difference in flavor between those two papers on that account. The only other thought that I have is very general.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Could you spell that out a little bit? What is the difference in methods and in the flavor?

MR. GECHMAN: I thought you were going to ask me that. For example, on page 7 of your paper, there are a couple of comments leading up to this, but this particular one: "To build a national library network on a state-by-state basis would be self-defeating and very costly."

I admit that this is taken out of context, but the flavor I got from reading this paper was that the Commission was thinking about going into this approach in a big, big way, the "big system" approach, phase by phase, but like all at once, in pieces,whereas our approach is just the opposite.

Our approach is that the long-term system which you described in general is exactly consistent with the long-term approach that we described. We call it the long-range solution. But if you recall, we give reasons why we believe that it is impractical and unworkable at this time, and that really is the kind of thing that I am talking about. In other words, as a systems man I know that complex systems, particularly when they are computer-complex systems, are very evolutionary, they are not born overnight, and they have to be developed in a very careful, phase-by-phase manner and given all of the others problems involved in putting that total system up and running, we feel, is what we feel will eventually happen. But it will be very time-consuming and very costly, and what you should do is build it in small segments, all leading toward that ultimate goal.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Would the segments be built in terms of some overall plan? In other words, I am trying to get at what you would think of the next step for this Commission now in filling this thing out and getting a national plan.

MR. GECHMAN: Okay. Also on page 7 are the few words, "Introduction of National Standards and Procedures." That to me is the critical number one objective that the Commission should strive for, because whatever is done and however it is done, it all should be under the auspices of a national plan.

The only other thought that I have beyond that is that we are in the midst of designing an experimental program between our respective companies to test some of the ideas in our paper: The idea of the information broker serving the remote user, the person without the library or with the librarian who really does not have enough knowledge to know how to access the tremendous amount of information sources that are available.

CHM. BURKHARDT: How long have you two gentlemen been working on this particular idea that you present here? That just didn't get done last weekend.

MR. HOUSMAN: Do you mean the paper that we wrote?

CHM. BURKHARDT: Yes.

MR. GECHMAN: Well, some of the ideas, I am sure that Ed will agree with me, have been in the thinking stage for a long time. I have done various consulting jobs for various government agencies involved in some of this in the past, but the actual paper was done in a matter of a few days. We had a meeting and we both presented our views to each other and we found that those views were reasonably consistent.

Ed put down an outline, and from that outline

I wrote the paper and then gave it to Ed, and he made all the technical, editorial corrections and changed his ideas and the paper resulted very quickly.

Insofar as how much time and effort went into this particular paper, not much, but how much time went into or was involved in the thinking about what this ought to look like, that has gone on for some time.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Would you like to take over now, Mr. Housman?

MR. HOUSMAN: Marv has just about said it all. As I read your paper, I found myself agreeing with almost every sentence and, in fact, the only difference is in the approach and maybe some particular ones.

Being from General Telephone, I was interested in your focus on telecommunications, and I think that is a very important aspect to look after.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Do you think that is a good idea?

MR. HOUSMAN: Yes, that is the only way really that is critical, I think, for a network working for the fast flow of information between libraries and wide band is the way to do it. It is very expensive and it has to be subsidized.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Would Mr. Lerner like to ask a question?

MR. LERNER: Yes. I am particularly intrigued by your concept of the information broker idea and I would like you to expand on that beyond what you have done in the paper.

MR. HOUSMAN: As I listened to the testimony, the focus of what people said was kind of foreign to me. I am from an industrial environment and I have been in government environment, but I have never been in a public library environment, and the problem that we stated in particular perhaps relates to our environment. Do you think that is true?

MR. GECHMAN: Yes.

MR. HOUSMAN: It is not a book problem; it is a problem of people trying to do something, getting the information to do it and not knowing where to go. Even a rather sophisticated librarian like the librarian from the Army Natick Lab was in to visit me yesterday, and I threw the idea out to her, and she said, "That will be wonderful, because I don't know where to get, for example, research in chemistry."

You know, she said it would be wonderful if she could just go to a place and state her need and obtain what she needed.

MR. LERNER: What I mean is, what kind of place? What is it, a whole new industry? What do they do? Can they have any storefronts? Do you call this on the phone? What is it?

MR. AINES: What kind of blueprint -- have you gone that far?

MR. HOUSMAN: Well, I would say that they should be, maybe for psychological reasons, local access. That is, the person should be one like in the northeastern Boston area and most of the contact should be by phone, I would say, and there may be several modes of accessing this by terminals perhaps, by telephone, by personal interview, much, I guess, like you would expect a real estate or a stockbroker to operate, by telephone, maybe.

MR. GECHMAN: Well, the answer is actually that people -- and the key word, I guess, is "marketing" -- as I see it, the information broker has to have a rapport with his users and he has gotto have an active marketing program so that that user knows that he is the information broker and knows that if requested, whatever information needed can be located with that one call, with no fuss, no bother, and one bill at the end, one combined list of references, or whatever the request, the response to a request is, and this thought occurred because in my experience so many people have such a little idea or knowledge of what is available and they have maybe some foggy notion, but they have absolutely no idea where to go or how to go about it. Even if there is a local library, believe it or not.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Mr. Cuadra, then Mr. Aines and then Mr. Becker.

MR. CUADRA: It seems to me there are probably 12 or 13 organizations that already exist that, from your description, I would call information brokers -- Westrak, the University of Southern California; Arak, at Indiana, and Nireak. Those are three of the six NASA centers. There is Lehigh University, University of Georgia, Iitri, etcetera, sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

Are you describing something that is different from those 13 existing centers?

MR. GECHMAN: Yes, and no. In our exhibit that is really necessary to refer to and talk about the concept, we do distinguish between a computer processing center, which all of these centers which you refer to are, as well as an information broker, which they also are. What I am saying is that there is a functional difference between these two activities. One is a marketing activity. In other words, like a stockbroker that you call up, you don't go to the New York Stock Exchange directly but you call him and he has the mechanism, he has the computer systems and he knows what to key in. Okay? But you are conversing and interacting with an individual who is a broker, and what I am doing is saying that the concept of the broker should be expanded greatly and even, if necessary, separated from the physical computer operations and other service operations. I think we pointed out in the paper and, if not, then Ed and I are in agreement, that these exhibits show functional categories, some of which can be combined. In other words, in one place you could have the broker, the computer processing center and the repository. It depends on how it is arranged.

T16 MR. CUADRA: Just a quick addition to that: There are some of these centers that are not computer centers, they are pure broker, at least one of them may be. There are others and one of them is at a university and one of the concerns that I understand NASA has, and maybe NSF has -- I don't know -- is, that while they have the computer power to do some of the jobs, they are very poor marketers.

My question is: Would you put a broker, an information broker organization, in a university context or in a public library or in a commercial sector? What kind of organization or entity do you have in mind?

MR. GECHMAN: Thatis a very good question because it is right at the heart of this whole idea. My personal opinion is that it should be in the commercial sector because they are the ones who are marketing oriented and they are the ones who have the profit motivation to do that marketing, to go out and develop that business. I don't say none of this exists in other centers, but the whole context of this thought is an active marketing program establishing a rapport between the brokers and the users, and I believe that can best be accomplished in a commercial environment.

MR. HOUSMAN: I might add one thing: that the broker would also be a person that might select between the three and the University of Georgia, so he may --

MR. LERNER: You mean the broker may subcontract?

MR. HOUSMAN. The broker may decide where to go for this piece of information. He should.

MR. AINES: My suggestion is: Don't put too much capital in this very quickly because what you are expressing here already exists perhaps not in the form that you are talking about, but in addition to what Carlos pointed out a moment ago, there are over a hundred informational agencies, centers supported by the government, in various places.

These fall into the scientific and technical areas and also other fields. Additionally, you have described in part what the Department of Agriculture does with its extension people that they have located, scattered throughout the country. Additionally, you have described what started to happen under the State Technical Services Act, where there were individuals set up in all of the states who brought technical information to industry and other groups within their state.

You have also described part of a program that the Foundation is supporting, the National Science Foundation, to the tune of about $4 and a half million a year, which is a brand new program that brings an intermediary down to the user, if you will, to help pull information from the stocks of knowledge created by federal R & D and other ways directly to using communities.

I might also point out to you that in each major city the General Services Administration has an information center, and I would agree that that is precisely not what you are talking about, but it also involves another point of entry into the system. But I would like to put that all aside and point out another thing that you should recognize. Namely, that when professionals want information, they use a prescribed route. When people want information in a general way who are not experts, they will follow another route.

For example, most people who are chemical engineers would probably go through a number of sources directly, they would not go through intermediaries. They go through where they view the knowledge existed into a new approach.

A student might go an entirely different route, or somebody peripheral to the chemical industry might go another route.

In a recent trip to Spain, for example, it was a matter of interest to me to see that the government had created central services out of Madrid, using some of the type services that you talked about here. When you went out into the field and talked to the people in Barcelona, where they have their major community dealing with technology, it was quite clear that they did not want to go through a central system, they wanted to go directly through the information bank, directly through the computer center. They did not want to go through intermediaries.

What I am pointing out to you is, it is

a very complex thing when you begin to talk about brokers and there are a number of stocks that have been made, some successful, some less than successful. I would suggest that if you want to get more deeply into that, you might call me in Washington and I will go into greater detail of what I know about it.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Joe Becker.

MR. BECKER: I just wanted to add that you probably know about it, that there are two commercial services operating in the world that are doing something like this, without a great deal of relationship to the computer.

One is S'il Vous Plait. Are you familiar with that, in Paris?

MR. GECHMAN: Yes.

MR. BECKER: And they have now opened stations in Japan and other countries. For a subscriber fee per year, you are able to telephone them up to a certain number of hours' work and they will respond or some organization will respond with the answer within 24 hours.

That has been functioning now for about 20 years and has become progressively more useful and more profitable, I might add.

There is another one in New York called FIND, and I don't know how well they are doing.

MR. GECHMAN: Right.

MR. BECKER: Those are the two commercial services. Also, the Minneapolis Public Library has a business service that they operate on a fee basis.

MR. HOUSMAN: I might comment on Andy's comment, that perhaps this just points up the need for such a thing. He listed a large number of information resources, many of which I am not familiar with, which I would like to be able to go to somebody who knew all these things and be able to use these.

MR. AINES: I would be very happy to open the doors for you.

MR. HOUSMAN: For me?

MR. AINES: Yes, sir.

MR. GECHMAN: It really is a very complex operation. When you first started, the thought that I had was that what you were saying was like the reason why this was a good idea, because there are indeed so many places to go. We find even very knowledgeable, experienced librarians are not aware of all of these areas, or of these sources, and in fact, in the bi bibliography we list five sources which demonstrate exactly what you are saying, one of which is the chapter in Volume 7 of ERIS, where we had 142 bibliographic data bases that were identified worldwide in 1971, and now there is something that I have identified which is around 175 and are growing.

So we are very much aware of what is available.

Just one very brief other comment, and that is another reason why the information broker is a good idea, which is because there are a lot of research and development-oriented companies who don't want other people to know what it is they are asking and they are very reluctant and so cozy, I know, that absolutely do not go out and ask anybody for anything because they will not let others know what subject areas they are interested in.

An information broker who would be a professional operation would handle himself in a manner whereby he would batch the requests so that when he goes and asks, the people doing the processing don't know who it really is who is asking, so that is really another aspect to it.

MR. CUADRA: I don't disagree with Andy Aines very often, but it is so close to drinking time that I can do it.

It seems to me, Andy, that the informational analysis centers are not really the kind of thing that Marvin and Ed are talking about because you cannot go to a center and have them run errands in other areas, you cannot go to the center on metals, if you happen to have an interest in ERIT education or something else. They don't do it. They do their own thing. And even the University of Georgia, which has 17 data bases that they search, won't help you if you ask for the18th. So I think, as they described the information broker, that kind of organization does not yet exist at the present time.

MR. AINES: Well, may I just point in reality what I am trying to help them with is to understand that there are a number of -- because you think the idea is good -- other people of similar ideas about the value of that approach, and you can save a lot of time as you develop your thoughts, since you mentioned you are working on the idea, by getting to know some of these other programs that are going on, that are akin, if not precisely to what you are doing. You might be in contact with these very people in order to get support, for example, in a number of fields, and I think you are entitled to know a little bit more about what we know that might save you some trouble, since you are kind enough to tell us what you think about our problems here.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Now, gentlemen, I see various nervous building superintendent people looking in. I think we ought to vacate the premises, but let me ask you one final question to see whether you would agree that we are going about this thing in the right way.

We have got this draft and we are passing it out to all kinds of people, including some people we consider to be rather professional and technically confident to give us their reactions. At the end of this process we think we will have something like a skeleton on which to really get to work.

Now, in getting to work on this, I presume we must turn it over to the full-time work of some systems people and all of that, but the question still arises: Do we ask them to come back with the whole plan for the whole thing, or do we ask them to tell us what the next phases are, and to do parts? Or what is is from the -- I suppose you are both systems people, aren't you? What would the systems way of going at this be and what are the merits of it? What would it call for? Am I asking a sensible question?

MR. HOUSMAN: Yes. I am not too sure I could answer because it is such a big system, it is such a complex thing.

CHM. BURKHARDT: That is why we suggest that maybe this intermediate phase, that this time the broker might not be the right thing, that there should be some intermediate phase, so that if it turns out to be too expensive,we could go on to something else. Do you think drafting the big system is a hopeless problem intellectually?

MR. HOUSMAN: No. It has to be done, and maybe even more to the point of identifying the elements of the system which are not really spelled out here.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Because it is obvious that this is going to be something very important for us to decide in the next couple of months.

Do you have something to say about that, Mr. Gechman?

MR. GECHMAN: Only to reiterate the fact that it is a very large and complex endeavor, and if it is done too rapidly and without, you know, coordination, a tremendous amount of expense and, I think, failures will be encountered. As I stated earlier, I believe that a system as immensely complex as this one should be done in a piecemeal fashion and that I believe that the establishment of all of our standards and procedures and as much involvement of the federal government in terms of financial support and pressure, if you will, to get the elements to comply with these standards and procedures, so that as all of these elements develop simultaneously, when they are eventually hooked up at the end, they will operate in a compatible fashion.

CHM. BURKHARDT: If I understand you correctly, I could still think of agreeing with you about building the system, but what about the plan? That is, getting the plan or group worked out in terms of when you start building the system?

MR. GECHMAN: Well, the way that I usually do it is to have alternative plans and carry each one down to a reasonable degree of definition. When you feel that you have got from a generic point of view the alternative plans, then you analyze them. After you analyze them individually, you analyze them collectively to determine which one of one or two or three are the candidates and you take those and go into further detail and you finally wind up with the one or two candidates, and then eventually you work it down to a single one.

CHM. BURKHARDT: Well, thank you very much. It has been very helpful.

[Whereupon, said hearing closed.]

* * * * *